NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

NO. DCLXXXIII

OCTOBER, 1912

# ROOSEVELT OR THE REPUBLIC!

BY THE EDITOR

Five weeks from the date of this number of the Review sixteen millions of accredited American citizens, representing more than one hundred millions of people, will signify at the polls their preferences from among the candidates for President of the United States. Last month we presented a study of the unexampled conditions which beset an unprecedented political situation. We now submit for consideration the lesson, drawn from reduction of all circumstances to the ultimate issue, which seems to our mind irresistible as a guide to wisely discriminative and truly patriotic action.

## MR. TAFT

If it were possible to re-elect President Taft, what would be the use? The incoming House of Representatives will surely be Democratic, and the Senate will just as surely be anti-Republican. Mr. Taft's continuance in office then could only involve prolongation of the government divided against itself, which has been the bane of the country during the past two years. No argument is needed to demonstrate the comparative futility and positive detriment of such administration; recent history speaks all too plainly. Witness the constant playing for partisan advantage, the incessant shifting of responsibilities, the perpetual evasions, which have

Copyright, 1912, by The North American Review Publishing Company. All Rights Reserved.



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

served only to maintain turmoil and uncertainty at a time when definiteness, above all things, was most to be desired.

Such a situation invariably invites demagogic proposals which would never be countenanced if there existed a possibility of their being made effective. Moreover, it is a patent fact that Mr. Taft has forfeited the authority which ordinarily pertains to his great office. Never before have a President's vetoes been overridden so casually or a President's most solemn admonitions been treated so nonchalantly by Congress. The punitive withdrawal and subsequent exculpatory restoral of patronage evoked only derisive comment from insurgent Republicans and their constitutents. Members of his own party ceased to regard the President's disfavor with apprehension; rightly or wrongly, they concluded that he had lost the hold upon the voters which a President usually retains; gradually they became convinced that open, as well as tacit, opposition to his expressed wishes would operate to their own advantage; and they acted accordingly. Coincidently and inevitably the fealty of his positive partisans became so impaired by the President's ineffective attempts to conciliate the disaffected, that hardly a corporal's guard could be mustered to his support in the latter days of the session. Meanwhile the cohesive and well-directed Democratic majority in the House of Representatives emphasized to advantage his vacillating inconsistencies with respect to tariff legislation in particular, and missed no opportunity, in general, to harass a temperament which, though exemplary in intent, is undeniably compromising in practice. Achievement in such circumstances necessarily became impossible, and Mr. Taft finally stood forth before the people as one self-shorn of the power which they had bestowed upon him.

There he stands to-day. There he would stand upon inauguration day of next year even though crowned with the approval of a re-election. The apathy which now characterizes the Republican canvass but faintly presages the gloom which then would overshadow a disheartened country facing another period of raging, because impotent, agitation. The Democratic party, refused the reward of the first true merit it has earned in twenty years, depressed by defeat when victory was deserved, could hardly fail to bury itself in sullen antagonism. The Republican party, feeding upon the husks of a partial and temporary triumph, deprived of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the accomplishment of the days of purification, would almost inevitably follow its predecessor into oblivion. Roosevelt alone would profit from the discordance within the administration and the resentments among the people. Then, if ever, would the way be cleared to establish the illusion that government through political parties, under the Constitution, by and with the force of tradition, has broken down in fact if not in theory; that results can be attained only through the substitution of personal direction for popular rule; that the time, indeed, has come when Law must give way to the Man.

Imagine the confusion that would arise from such a situation! Consider what it has been; what it is, even at the seeming breaking of the dawn! If the present condition of common unrest in the very midst of uncommon prosperity be the consequence of complete control assumed under the most favorable auspices, what is the outcome that could be anticipated in reason from the work of warring elements begun with the setting of the sun of the party of the President?

We yield to none in respect or regard for Mr. Taft. As true an American, as honest and honorable a man, as faithful and forgiving a friend, as just a judge, as conscientious and unselfish an administrator of laws as ever lived, his record as President nevertheless is a register of failure, not because he is a man of straw, but because he is not a man of iron. It is a circumstance only, in no sense a personal discredit, that even the accession of Mr. Sherman, under the provisions of antiquated statutes, would be hardly more calamitous, in the present state of public feeling, than the re-election of President Taft.

### MR. WILSON

A prime reason for installing a Democratic administration is to be found in the fact that the Democratic party has proven by its works that it is entitled to the confidence of the country and deserves a trial. Wherever it has held control during the past few years, whether in Congress, in States, or in municipalities, it has acquitted itself of the suspicion of unfitness to govern. Its vagaries have vanished; its policies have become concrete; its chosen officials have been exemplary. Unfortunate is the people whose one half continues too long in authority and whose other half feels no sense of responsibility other than that of indefinite opposi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion. The political strength of England lies in the transference of power at comparatively regular intervals and the consequent sharing of both burdens and honors. The Republican party would not be in the throes of despair today if it had been defeated more frequently in the past half-century; the Democratic party would have been resuscitated long ago but for the disease engendered in the fifties by arrogant assurance. So long as no vital principle is imperiled occasional change is desirable, not merely for the sake of change, but to compel the maintenance of high standards by political organizations in seeking the approval of the country. The probable transference of authority during the forthcoming year, then, is to be welcomed as an omen of real unity and mutual confidence.

A most important practical reason for electing a Democratic President lies in the approbation already won by the House of Representatives which virtually guarantees a Democratic Congress. Full party responsibility, as we have already noted, is a prime requisite of adequate and sober performance.

A third potent cause for aiding the Democratic party at this time is to be found in the character of its candidate and in the manner of his selection. Of all the perversions of truth adventured by Mr. Roosevelt, none is more outrageous than his brazen insistence that Mr. Wilson's nomination was effected by discredited bosses. All such men opposed him to the limit of their resources and to the very end of possibilities of successful resistance. This is a statement of fact so patent that it requires no demonstration. And it becomes a fact of mighty import when one realizes that scores of years have elapsed since a successful candidate entered upon his canvass before the people wholly free, as Governor Wilson is free, from political, pecuniary, or personal obligation to any individual or group of men. The further certainty that he will maintain his complete independence to Election Day, even if need be at the hazard of defeat, marks that which we may reasonably hope will be celebrated as the beginning of a new and more wholesome era in the history of American politics.

But it is not as an alternative, however preferable, that Governor Wilson should be regarded as a candidate. The reasons for his election are affirmative and positive, deduced from a study of his personal characteristics and from his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

record as a public official. One year ago, in an endeavor to outline his worthiness as a possible recipient of the nomination, we summarized his qualifications in these words:

"*Because he is thoroughly equipped, mentally and morally, by birth, training, and experience.*

"A good inheritance from a virile ancestry is a great help to one who has to make his way in the world. Money has its uses in this country. Titles are not to be despised in other lands. Good breeding is desirable everywhere. Far more valuable than all combined are the attributes which crystallize into character. These constituted Wilson's heritage. . . . Brains, conscience, convictions, he inherited. Character he developed under the tutelage of the scholarly divine who was his father.

"Intelligence of the highest and rarest is peculiarly essential in a President at this time. And such is the order of Wilson's. His sense is anything but common; it is most uncommon—keen, searching, penetrating, going straight to the root of difficulty, intent upon finding, not a palliative, but a cure. In his case to a notable degree felicity of expression rests upon clarity of thought. Wilson is not an orator in the accepted meaning of the term. He does not utilize sound in public speaking. His phrases are not rounded for purely rhetorical effect, and he never declaims. Yet no American now living can hold the attention of an audience so closely. The reason is simple. He seeks the understanding rather than the admiration of his hearers. Each word conveys a definite meaning, each is selected with precision, and each finds its rightful place. His eloquence is knowledge, not art, and its convincingness lies in its simplicity. The auditor feels that a conclusion wrought by processes of logic is the crux of the utterance. And the intuition is correct. Wilson invariably has a reason for an opinion, and always has it ready for use. Although positive, he is never dogmatic. Telling why he thinks as he does is what gives himself no less than his hearer the greatest pleasure and satisfaction. That Wilson has wider information respecting theories of government than another, or perhaps any other, is not surprising. All his life has been given to its acquisition. But it is not enough to possess knowledge. One must be able to impart and elucidate its lessons. And, thanks to his experience as a teacher, few will deny that in this respect Wilson was not excelled even by Madison or by Hamilton, and stands to-day actually pre-eminent.

"*Because his proposals are intelligently radical.*

"Whatever is, is conservative. The referendum is required to effect a change in fundamental law. A proposal to eliminate it would be radical. So is a suggestion to extend its application to statutes. Obviously there is no disparity in principle. To any change whatsoever that militates against self-interest the opprobrious term is applied indignantly by the one who considers himself most concerned. From this viewpoint the very provision for making a change contained in the Constitution itself is radical. Again, what was radical yesterday becomes conservative to-day. To free the slaves was the most radical proposal ever made in this country, because the act not only violated property rights as guaranteed by the Constitution, but was done in frank disregard of the technical prohibition of that great instrument, under the specious guise of military necessity.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"So now with the proposal to free the people by restoring to them the power of governing themselves. That is the first and dominant article in the creed of Woodrow Wilson. Not that they are now deprived of that prerogative, as might have happened through substitution of a monarchical form of government. Nothing so obvious as that. Only this: that the process has been rendered so difficult that, instead of governing themselves, the many have come under the dominance of the few, who act by indirection and under cover of the darkness of secrecy to achieve their own purposes. Whether or not this is the actual condition may be a matter of opinion, but to those who have watched and analyzed the work of State legislatures, and more particularly that of the Federal Congress with respect to the tariff, it seems a patent fact. Moreover, the constant unrest of the masses during recent years bears evidence of their feeling that the road to effective legislation has been made too tortuous to tread.

"Wilson says: Open an avenue through the jungle.

"But how? By direct primaries for all elective offices, President and Vice-President included. By popular election of Senators. By open conventions, caucuses, and committees. By legislation in the full light of day. By full discussion of measures before the faces of the people. *If and when necessary,* by Initiative, Referendum, and Recall.

"These are the means proposed. They are radical because they involve change. *But the purpose aimed at is conservative*—conservative of republican institutions. If it be not achieved, our theory of government is belied, our faith in majority rule as the beacon-light of humanity is crushed, our confidence in the desire and willingness of a democracy to safeguard both property and personal rights is forsworn. This way, and this way only, safety lies.

"*Because he is constructive and effective.*

"Ignorance may be destructive; passion often is; intelligence never. To-day, in this country abounding in resources, energy, and skill, industry pauses, business lags, development has practically ceased. Why? The answer is universal: Uncertainty, resulting in lack of confidence. In such a condition, what is the chief need? Clearly, unless we admit failure of popular government, a revival of the recognition of mutuality of interest.

"'We have passed the time of excitement, of general complaint, of undiscriminating condemnation,' says Wilson. 'There has been hostility enough all around. What we need now is to take common counsel as to what is for common benefit, for the good of the country and of the several communities in which we live and earn our bread and also our happiness. We need frank, outspoken, friendly opinion. We need criticism which is not intended to damage, but to create a better understanding all around. To have any fear or favor in the matter is to be untrue to every standard of public duty. . . . We want to put business on a sound basis and with the assurance that when we have done it we have not destroyed anything, but have reconstructed. We want definite information as to what the law means and what it provides. We don't know now what the offense is and what the penalty is.'

"Some assume to think otherwise, but are disposed to temporize when asked to elucidate. Wilson, be it observed, never blinks a fact. Nor does he hesitate to speak as plainly and explicitly to a powerful aggregation or organization as to an individual. He does not believe that Labor can

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

profit by championing inefficiency and idleness through Union rules, and says so because he 'knows of no other standard by which to judge these things than the interest of the whole community,' and surely 'the laboring man cannot benefit himself by injuring the interests of the country.'

"So, too, with the captains of industry, who must come to recognize that they are 'trustees, not masters,' of properties whose management 'determines the development or decay of communities' and is 'the means of lifting or depressing the life of the whole country.' Such men 'should regard themselves as representatives of a public power' and act accordingly, because the opportunities of all are affected, their property touched, their savings absorbed, and their employment determined by these agencies.

"All Wilson asks of corporations is that they give the people honest service at a reasonable rate, not with the primary idea of squeezing and exploiting them, but with the primary idea of serving them. Nor can he perceive any advantage in dissolving corporations, however great, when so doing serves only to throw great undertakings out of gear, to the infinite loss of thousands of innocent persons, and to the great inconvenience of society as a whole. Regulation, not disintegration, is Wilson's remedy for existing evils, without regard to the 'size or might' of the corporation, 'if you will but abandon the fatuous, antiquated, and unnecessary fiction which treats it as a legal person, as a responsible individual.' He would be loath to sacrifice the 'efficiency and economy' which tend to stimulate rather than destroy competition, and he would applaud and encourage the builders of properties, however great, while sternly condemning and repressing mere manipulators who deceive and swindle the public.

"In working out these problems, moreover, 'the Democratic party must be a party of law and of service within the law. If we cannot serve the country under the law, we must ask the people to change the law. We must not take it upon ourselves to change it without their consent.'

"Upon utterances such as these Woodrow Wilson was elected Governor of New Jersey. To carry out his pledges he was obliged to win the support of a Republican Senate and to beat down the opposition of the bosses within his own party. He did both by appealing directly to the people, and placed upon the statute-books a record of constructive and effective legislation unmatched in the history of any State. Destruction followed—destruction of the control of State government by a public-service corporation; that and no other.

"*Because he is free.*

"We have the highest authority for the declaration that no man can serve two masters; and yet how many in public life have tried and are now trying! Not willingly, many; not wittingly, some; but perforce. One owes his advancement to a class, another to a political machine, a third to an individual. We have had such Presidents.

"Undue blame should not attach to the individual for such a performance, even though it be in effect a betrayal of trust. Custom is a mighty power, and loyalty to one or to a few is less easily disregarded than fidelity to all. Circumstances and environment, too, are most potent agencies. Few have attained great political prominence without making alliances and incurring lasting obligations in the successive stages of advancement. Nor can many withstand the influence upon perspective of association.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"It is not, then, so much a matter of condemnation of others as of congratulation upon the mere incident that Wilson is free. Whether or not, in like situations with others, covering years of office-seeking, he would have become likewise entangled, is beside the mark. It is the *fact* that is important and peculiarly fortuitous at a time when, if ever, it is desirable that a President should have the whole people as his one and only master.

"That such is indeed the case with Wilson hardly requires demonstration. It is evidenced conclusively by his every word and deed. To the leadership which effected his own nomination for Governor upon a platform guaranteeing specific reforms he stood ready to accord due recognition, but when that leadership came into conflict with faithful performance of public duties he could not and did not hesitate to choose and to serve the one master to whom he had pledged his own allegiance. He did not attempt to weigh obligations, the one against the other; he did not temporize nor try to harmonize. The straight and narrow path pointed out to him in his youth was the only one he knew—and he took it, disdainful of personal criticism and heedless of personal consequences. That exceptional credit should be accorded him for so doing does not follow necessarily. The forces impelling his conduct were inherited conscience and developed character, agencies, however, as valuable in the public service as they happily have proven to be irresistible in the man.

"It is as a highly important fact, too, rather than as a matter of personal merit, that Wilson's environment, associations, and sphere of endeavor have tended to keep high his ideals, to broaden his vision, and to intensify his resolution. To have achieved great prominence and the rich emoluments which accompany success at the bar would have been a meritorious performance and worthy of all praise, but in no way commensurate with the advantages he derived from enforced industry, from enforced frugality, from enforced association and sympathy with those who, like himself, were compelled to earn their bread and rear their children with the product of brain and toil.

"Such necessity and such environment make for that freedom of understanding which is no less the requisite of a great magistracy than freedom from political obligation to any except to all.

"*Because he is a Democrat.*

"Government *by* as well as of and for the people was first proposed and put into practice by Thomas Jefferson, who thereupon became the first real Democrat. As a student and philosopher he beheld danger in heeding the customs of the past and restricting to a class, however capable, the possession of actual governing powers. He felt the need of broadening the base of government to insure the stability of the structure of democracy. To do so involved implicit faith in the wisdom and sense of justice in the entire body politic. But this he had, and, acting upon his judgment, endeavored by precept and example to instil the theory of true democracy into the minds of the people. Denounced as a radical, even as a revolutionist, he grew stronger and more determined under opposition, until what had been only an impulse originally became a passionate conviction. Reaction followed as a matter of course. Habit of mind is not changed permanently with ease. But the spirit which inspired Jefferson could not be killed. It flashed forth incongruously for a time in Jackson, then waned through long years, until it burst into flame

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Lincoln, only to subside again in a period of great development and common prosperity, until there arose from apathy and indifference another governing class—the oligarchy of the Republican party—which has really ruled the Nation as with a rod of iron, even through two administrations which were nominally Democratic and one as spasmodic as Jackson's, to the present day, and is breaking down at last only under the added weight of heedless greed.

"The time is ripe and the people are now ready for a fresh manifestation of the spirit of true democracy, which alone can safeguard personal and property rights by perpetuating the Republic. It is to be found in Woodrow Wilson, the natural successor by birth, instinct, training, ability, courage, and *faith in the people* of Thomas Jefferson."

These were true words then; they are yet more surely true now, as is evidenced by Governor Wilson's unswerving fidelity to his best instincts, by his studied aloofness from political manipulation, by his deliberate refusals to temporize or compromise in the tempestuous days immediately preceding the convention, by his serene acquiescence in presumed defeat during the proceedings, by his calm yet appreciative acceptance of the unexpected result, and by the telling restraint which has marked his every subsequent utterance.

If it be the fact, as we believe, that Mr. Wilson was not the first choice of the great majority of Democrats at the time of the convention, and yet, if the candidate were to be named now, not a voice would be raised in opposition to his nomination, no further proof is required of his growth in the estimation of his fellow-men or of his supreme capacity to meet satisfactorily any test to which he may be subjected in the crucible of time. No good cause can be shown why any true Democrat *should not* or why any patriotic Republican *may not* conscientiously and with full knowledge cast his ballot for Woodrow Wilson to become President of the United States.

### MR. ROOSEVELT

If Roosevelt should be accorded a third term, what would happen? "I know of no way of judging the future," said Patrick Henry to the Virginia convention, "but by the past." It is a true test which, however, in this instance, despite the proverbial shortness of men's memories, need hardly be applied. The salient movements in the seamy record of Roosevelt's advancement, from a solemn pledge to follow the prudent course marked by his predecessor to the domineering designation of his own successor, are still

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so fresh in mind that the scathing indictment which would ensue from their recapitulation readily forms itself.

We are deterred, moreover, from painting the picture in historic detail by a sense of shame. The first twenty-five Presidents of the United States possessed talents in varying degree. Some were less forceful, some less courageous, some less broad-minded, some less far-seeing than others, but all were conscious of the dignity of the great position, all were deeply impressed by cognizance of their grave responsibilities, all recognized their own limitations, all were appreciative of the influence for good or ill of their personal examples, all strove assiduously and successfully to exemplify the qualities which inhere in men of honor and breeding.

Roosevelt was the first President whose chief personal characteristic was mendacity, the first to glory in duplicity, the first braggart, the first bully, the first betrayer of a friend who ever occupied the White House. It is with distaste amounting almost to nausea that we are forced, in performance of public duty, to recall his breaking of his solemn pledge to the American people to observe the most vital of their great traditions; his disingenuous evasions; his brazen disregard of his own written promise; his blatant professions of exceptional probity at the very moment when he was bartering his official influence for large sums of money to be used in the corruption of voters; his boisterous and profane denials of accusations which he knew to be founded in fact; his precipitation of a panic by unconscionable mouthings; his cynical rejoicing at pecuniary losses which he had brought upon a few without heed of the havoc which he had wrought for the many; his hasty and affrighted yielding to pressure exerted by interested persons when he became convinced that common calamity was impending; his flagrant violation of his oath of office when he agreed to suspend the enforcement of specific laws; his deliberate stoppage of prosecution of a trust which the official inquiry ordered by himself had shown to be guilty, at the behest of one who had added the savings of the poor to his corruption fund and who continues to be his chief supporter; his arbitrary discharge, for personal reasons, of honorable prosecutors who persisted in proceeding against a confessed rebater; his vituperative assaults upon trade combinations whose numbers he was permitting simultaneously and covertly to multiply; his shameful abetting of a revolution in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

violation of a solemn treaty, to the everlasting dishonor of his country, to gratify his craving of personal glory; his violent denunciation of a publicist as an accomplice in the assassination of his predecessor, only later to welcome him, for political reasons, to a chair beneath the presentment of that martyred President; his savage condemnation as crooks and scoundrels of just judges who refused to hound journalists to jail through misinterpretation of the law; his constant vilifying of bosses in public while secretly strengthening the hands of all who subserved his wishes; his brutal refusal of justice to a faithful and dying public servant whom he had wantonly wronged; his virtual stigmatizing of a great Archbishop as a falsifier of spoken words; his ferocious treatment of a helpless woman pleading for consideration; his blaring of trumpets; his gun-carrying; his exploiting of the language of the prize-ring in the White House; his sickening repetitions of the personal pronoun in public speeches and official communications; his cuttlefish politics; his shameless demagogy; his perpetual lying; all these are spots upon the light from the lamp of experience to which we would but cannot blind our eyes.

Of Roosevelt's conduct since he forsook the White House we need not speak. His bloody deeds in Africa, his lecturing of foreign potentates, his attempt to make political capital through insolent disregard of common amenities in Rome, his denunciation of the President as a thief and a pickpocket to distract attention from his own attempts at wholesale robbery, his brazen *volte-face* on reciprocity to catch the votes of a class, his silly baiting of equal suffragists, his yawping about bosses while eating from the hand of the worst political brigand of his day, his profiting from the plunder which his own official co-operation enabled his most intimate political associate to wring from the American farmers, his outrageously false accounts of the nomination of his Democratic opponent, his insidious wheedling of the specially favored few, his open pandering to the mob in the name of righteousness for the sake of self; these are symptoms of distinguishing personal traits too recently displayed and too familiar to call for recital.

Mr. Taft, as we have shown from the record, would be shorn of the power of accomplishment by the antagonism of both Houses of Congress. Clearly, since less than fifty Progressives have appeared as candidates for the na-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional Legislature, Roosevelt would face a yet stronger opposition; but there the analogy ends. Mr. Taft recognizes the limitations fixed by the Constitution upon executive authority; Roosevelt makes plain by his words and has proven by his acts that he holds them in derision.

He not only avows openly, in flat contradiction of the Constitution, that all power not textually conferred upon Congress and the courts is vested in the President, but he also boasts of encroachments already made upon designated prerogatives. He " took Panama and let Congress debate afterward "; he removed official records in the case of the Harvester Company from the Government department and sequestered them in the White House to prevent their submission to the Senate; he created an army of spies at enormous expense without authority of law; he partially nullified the pure-food law by appointing a " referee board " to pass upon the use of adulterants; he took sixteen millions a year from the public treasury for pensions by " executive order "; he now proposes, if elected, to designate a tariff board with " real power " to usurp the functions of Congress and compel the manufacturer to put into the pay-envelope of the workman such proportion of the " prize money " wrung from the customer as *he* may consider equitable.

The lawfulness of this or any like proceeding he would not consider even as a question. He would act first, as in the Panama case, and let the courts adjudicate later. If his performance should be pronounced illegal he would seek a popular recall of the judicial decision. He would take the oath to " protect, preserve, and defend the Constitution," just as he solemnly affirmed that he would not accept a third term, but he would consider himself freed from obligation to observe it by his own published declaration that " in great crises it may be necessary to overrun Constitutions, to disregard statutes." He would hold, with certain justification, that he had been chosen by the people to be their personal tribune, with the full understanding upon their part that he should rule on their behalf in the interest of social justice, unhampered by technical restrictions, unfettered by antiquated documents, and answerable only to the majority who, with eyes open, had designated him as their spokesman and delegated agent.

To any who might condemn his arbitrary acts he could

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and would respond, with show of reason, that he was guilty of no false pretense, that his scorn of Congress was well known, that his contempt of courts had been thoroughly advertised, that his disdain of nominal monarchs had been forcefully asserted, that his disregard of law had been made manifest in word and by deed; and that, therefore, the sovereign people, in electing him as their President, had constituted him their viceregent, with full authority to put into effect the remedial measures which he had promised to initiate on their account. To this end he would hold himself not free, but bounden, to utilize to the fullest extent, not only the greatest power possessed by any human being, but all other conceivable means, whether of persuasion or of force.

Is there any rational doubt that this is the attitude which would be promptly, truculently, and in large measure justifiably assumed by the supreme egoist of his day when once again raised to the pinnacle of fame and power by the declared will of the American people? If not, there exists little need of speculation respecting consequences. By virtue of their own heedless or uncomprehending decree registered on November 5th, Inauguration Day of 1913 would mark the beginning of a determined effort to establish a benevolent despotism over American freemen. Those who jest at this as a vain imagining either know not what they do or wilfully veil their eyes.

It is not the foreign war so commonly anticipated as a consequence of Roosevelt's accession to the dizzy height of unrestrained authority that makes for dread; it is the civil strife that would almost inevitably ensue from patriotic resistance to usurpation by a half-mad genius at the head of the proletariate.

There is no escape from this conclusion in the main. Grant, for consideration's sake, that our fears be exaggerated. Assume absurdly the growth of a restraining influence upon a mind which has already become so riotous that it has repelled every sober counselor. Admit the remote possibility of a return to the humbleness befitting a finite being. Anticipate, if able, the softening of a temperament which has become so hardened through raging disappointment that it could not fail to be exultant in realized ambition! Imagine, if sufficiently gifted, a new and unheralded Roosevelt embodying the calmness of Washington, the patience of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lincoln, the caution of McKinley, and the firmness of Cleveland!

What then? Could Roosevelt, if he would, quell the spirits of revolt against a government of checks and balances which he himself had summoned from the depths of discontent, if once he were raised to the topmost wave? Never once in his innumerable declarations has he so much as intimated that he would urge his fantastic proposals upon Congress. Never once has he said that he would seek the co-operation of the courts. On the contrary, he flatly asserts upon all occasions that he would either disregard or bulldoze the one and would ignore or override the other.

It is upon his avowed and reiterated judgment that our fundamental doctrines have become obsolete and upon his definite pledge to supplant them with others of his own making that Roosevelt seeks the suffrages of the people. The method is not new. It had long thriven among the false teachers of Israel when God commanded His children:

"If there arise among you a prophet or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder,

"And the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them;

"Thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams: for the Lord your God proveth you."

It continued to find expression from time to time throughout the ages.

"My person," declared the Bourbon pretender, "is nothing. My principle is everything. France will see the end of all trials as soon as she will understand this. I am the pilot who alone is able to lead the vessel into the port. France cannot perish, for our Saviour still loves His Frenchmen, and if God has decreed the salvation of a nation He sees to it that the scepter of justice is placed in such hands only as are strong enough to carry it."

The feigned self-abnegation, the cool assumption of divine designation, the insistence upon personal possession of the scepter of justice, the very words uttered by the Comte de Chambord in 1873 are those of Roosevelt to-day. He is nothing; his principle is everything; he is the pilot who alone can guide the ship; to his strong hands and to no others must be consigned the scepter of social justice, to the end that the dying nation shall be saved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Can it lie within the range of possibility that the intelligent American people will grant the appeal which the ignorant French peasantry rejected with scorn? Incredulous of danger as we may be, are we willing to take so much as a chance of inviting a struggle for the very life of the Republic at the instigation of an American Boulanger who, uncontent with honors equal to those conferred upon the Father of His Country, stretches forth eager hands for the glory of a Diaz or a Cæsar and shouts continually, "If they want the sword, then we will give them the sword"?

Roosevelt or the Republic? That is the issue which transcends all others. It cannot be evaded or left in abeyance. It must be answered on November 5th, no less by Republicans, whose party and whose President have been robbed of the possibility of success by the ingrate whom they had cherished, than by Democrats whose fealty to democracy has been demonstrated by their selection of a standard-bearer who walks in the footsteps of Jefferson.

### CONCLUSION

We demonstrated last month by thorough analysis of existing conditions that President Taft cannot be re-elected. The fact then stated is now admitted by all competent observers, partisans and non-partisans alike, who can be induced to express their real belief.

We declared our firm conviction then and reiterate it now that Mr. Roosevelt has practically no chance of obtaining a majority in the Electoral College.

We emphasized our hope and asserted our belief that Mr. Wilson would win at the polls. Subsequent happenings—notably the elections in Maine and Vermont—have strengthened that judgment.

But it would be a folly and a crime to rest upon an assumption, however well grounded, as to how sixteen millions of men will vote upon a certain day. The election of Roosevelt would be a national calamity of incalculable magnitude. The utter chaos which would ensue from no election by the people could have but one of three results:

1. The election of Wilson, by the aid of the votes of Republican Representatives.
2. The succession of Sherman.
3. The temporary accession of Knox, to be followed by another national election in 1913.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Whatever the final outcome, there could be no escape from confusion such as the country has experienced but once in its history. Confidence would be shaken; business would be paralyzed; demagogism would become rampant; constitutional government would be put to severest test; and American institutions would be gravely imperiled.

Roosevelt would be a potent, if not indeed a determining, factor in a situation whose aggravation might easily end in catastrophe, and which can be averted only *by the election by the people* of Wilson—the only candidate who can possibly obtain a majority of electoral votes.

There can be no question of the plain duty of all patriotic Republicans in this emergency. It is to join with equally patriotic Democrats in making assurance doubly sure. They saved their party from Roosevelt in convention. Now let them help to save the country from the same menace at the polls. No man can foresee the real and ultimate effect of a vote for Taft, but—

A VOTE FOR WILSON IS A VOTE FOR WILSON.

THE EDITOR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# WHY I AM FOR TAFT

BY JOHN HAYS HAMMOND

To any fair-minded Republican who has believed that the supremacy of his party has been indispensable to the welfare of the nation there should be no hesitation in voting for President Taft in the coming election. Disregarding the other parties as negligible factors, I have the choice of voting for the Bull Moose party—*i. e.*, Theodore Roosevelt—the Democratic party, or the Republican party.

As to the Bull Moose party: The political issue to-day, so far as represented by the Bull Moose movement, is whether or not Theodore Roosevelt shall be elected President of the United States on November 5, 1912, and, therefore, to get at the gist of the question I must, though reluctant to do so, discuss the Bull Moose movement chiefly with reference to Theodore Roosevelt's qualifications for the Presidency. No fair-minded man can deny that Theodore Roosevelt is as essential to the Bull Moose movement as is Hamlet to Shakespeare's great tragedy by that name; and that if anything should happen to cause the retirement of Theodore Roosevelt from public life the elimination of his great personality from the Roosevelt movement would undoubtedly cause the Bull Moose party to collapse as a house of cards. The very fact that a political party is dependent for its creation and continued existence upon the domination of any one man, however exalted may be his aims and however admirable his attributes, is in itself a menace to our political institutions, for it makes possible, under certain political exigencies, the future advent into public life of an unscrupulous demagogue whose influence might place in jeopardy a government where principles and not men should prevail.

For many years I have been an admirer of Theodore Roosevelt, but during the past several months I have become



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disillusioned as to his character. I know that there are many Republicans of the highest integrity and patriotism enrolled under the banner of Theodore Roosevelt; but, in common with many of his former zealous supporters who have declined to join his new party, I believe that these men have been misled, being influenced by an indiscriminating admiration for Theodore Roosevelt because of the great service he rendered to his party and to his country during his earlier political career. These men do not realize, it seems to me, that the Theodore Roosevelt of that time was different from the newer Theodore Roosevelt, who, through overweening political ambition, desire for self-aggrandizement, and lust for power, has sacrificed his reputation for loyalty to friend, to party, and to country. *"Theodore Roosevelt has parted company with his better self!"*

As an American proud of the past history of his country and solicitous for its future welfare I am unalterably opposed to a Presidential third term. The attitude of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson on this important question, the opinions so forcibly expressed on several occasions by Theodore Roosevelt himself, should, it seems to me, represent the views of all patriotic Americans, irrespective of party affiliations. In his famous letter to the Legislature of Vermont Jefferson concludes by saying:

"I shall unwillingly be the person who, disregarding the sound precedent set by an illustrious predecessor, should furnish the first example of prolongation beyond the second term of office."

Here is Theodore Roosevelt's own renunciation, dated November 8, 1904:

"On the 4th of March I shall have served three and one-half years, and this three years and a half constitutes my first term. The wise custom which limits the President to two terms regards the substance and not the form, and under no circumstances will I again be a candidate for or accept another nomination for President."

Reiterating his views on December 11, 1907, Theodore Roosevelt said:

"I have not changed and shall not change that decision thus announced" (referring to the above renunciation).

Notwithstanding this, on February 26, 1912, the newer Theodore Roosevelt said: "I will accept the nomination for President if it is tendered me." And on June 22, 1912,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at Chicago, Theodore Roosevelt said: "I thank you for your nomination." Out of his own mouth is he convicted of an attempt to destroy a precedent which had come to assume the importance, in the minds of all Americans, of a great unwritten law standing as a bulwark against a perpetual President or the restoration of a monarchical form of government.

Up to Saturday, 7 P.M., June 22, 1912, the platform, the machinery, and the associations of the Republican party were good enough for Theodore Roosevelt. Until then he was eager to lead the Republican hosts against the common enemy. But observe that after that hour had signalized his defeat as a candidate for the nomination Theodore Roosevelt induced himself and others to believe that the Republican party no longer measures up to its political responsibilities, but has forfeited the confidence of the nation.

It is edifying to recall the position taken by Theodore Roosevelt preceding the announcement of his candidacy for the Republican nomination. Assuming a position of spectacular dignity, Mr. Roosevelt had several times stated that he was not and would not be a candidate for that nomination. Later, however, he was forced to admit that he would accept the nomination for the Presidency, provided he received the solicitation of the great body of American people. Failing to receive from that source a spontaneous demand for his services as the political redeemer of his party and the savior of his country, Theodore Roosevelt, abetted largely by the machinations of disappointed aspirants for office under the Taft administration, by certain notorious political bosses, and by the magnates of "good" trusts, endeavored to work up what should appear to the public as a spontaneous and, indeed, an irrepressible movement for the recall of this modern Cincinnatus from the felling of trees to public life. Never in the history of pre-convention campaigns has there been an organization so efficient and so lavishly provided with funds to secure the nomination of the "people's choice" for the Presidency of the United States. The "We want you, Teddy" attempt was a fiasco, humiliating to a degree to his patriotic countrymen.

Having failed to secure the desired nomination, it was necessary to find an excuse, upon the part of Theodore Roosevelt's followers, for a defection and for the formation of a new party, the Roosevelt party. The principal excuse ad-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vanced was that Theodore Roosevelt had been defrauded of the nomination for the Presidency at the Republican convention held in Chicago, and the cry of " stolen delegates " was adopted as the slogan of the new party. My readers will recall the fact that preceding the Chicago convention Theodore Roosevelt's followers claimed to control a large number of Southern delegates to that convention. To those of us who followed the political activities of Mr. Roosevelt's managers in different parts of the country, and especially in the Southern States, the object in claiming these delegates was apparent. Our views were confirmed subsequently when, in an unguarded moment, Mr. Frank Munsey's paper, the Washington *Times,* under date of June 9th, made the following statement:

*" For psychological effect, as a move in practical politics, it was necessary for the Roosevelt people to start contests on these early Taft selections of delegates in order that a tabulation of delegate strength could be put out that would show Roosevelt holding a good hand* [*sic.*]. *In the game a table showing Taft 150, Roosevelt 19, contested none, would not be very much calculated to inspire confidence* [*sic.*], *whereas one showing Taft 25, Roosevelt 19, contested 127, looked very different* [*sic.*]. *That is the whole story of the larger number of Southern contests that were started early in the game."*

From this it will be seen that the charge of " stolen delegates " was, to use Theodore Roosevelt's shorter and uglier word, " a lie " out of whole cloth. It was manufactured in cold calculation for the very reasons given in Mr. Munsey's truthful but indiscreet confession, and surely there is no higher authority on this subject than Mr. Frank Munsey himself. That Theodore Roosevelt was not robbed of the nomination can be clearly proved by reference to the contests before the National Committee in Chicago. Of the 228 contests, 164 were abandoned as being entirely too frivolous to be even submitted to the Committee on Credentials. The fraudulent contests, for the most part, were rejected unanimously or with but a few dissenting votes of the National Committee, many members of which were strong Roosevelt men. Before Mr. Roosevelt invoked the stigma of the Eighth Commandment upon the actions of the National Committee, " Thou shalt not steal," he should have refreshed his memory with the fact that there are equally important

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Commandments: "Thou shalt not covet" and "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." But even if there had been room for a difference of opinion as to whether or not President Taft had a majority of the delegates whose titles to their seats were unquestionable, it is the fact, nevertheless, that *Theodore Roosevelt could not, under any circumstances, have obtained honestly a majority of the delegates required to nominate him.* The proceedings of that convention were conducted according to rules which have always controlled Republican national conventions—rules under which Mr. Roosevelt has himself been nominated on three occasions to high offices. Had the Chicago convention, through intimidation by the threat of a bolt on the part of the Roosevelt faction, declined to award to the Taft faction the majority of the contested delegates, it is true that President Taft would not have been renominated, and it is possible that some well-known follower of Theodore Roosevelt—as, for example, Governor Hadley of Missouri—might have received the nomination; but the nomination of any other man than himself would not have served the purposes of Theodore Roosevelt. It was Rooseveltism, not Progressivism, that governed his actions.

"A complainant should come into court with clean hands." Were Theodore Roosevelt's hands clean? Did he not know of the efforts that had been made to dishonestly secure votes for him in the convention? Did he not know that his backers had made every possible endeavor to secure for him the votes of Southern delegates who had actually been pledged to Mr. Taft by their State conventions? When the inside history of the Chicago convention is written up it will not reflect credit upon those who were afterward involved in the attempt to deceive the public by the cry of "stolen delegates." Can any fair-minded man believe that all of the Taft adherents on the National Committee would lend themselves to a conspiracy to deprive Theodore Roosevelt of votes to which he was fairly entitled? This is preposterous. And yet the pro-Roosevelt press has endeavored to make the question of "stolen delegates" of sufficient importance not only to justify a bolt from the party, but for the creation of a new party to commit the heinous offense of political patricide. Many of the men on the National Committee, I may add, had been for years personal friends and former political associates of Theodore Roosevelt.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now, on the other side of the ledger of political morality, how is it possible to justify the attempt being made to steal from President Taft the electoral votes of certain States in the interests of the Bull Moose candidate? Is this consistent with the high political morality preached by Theodore Roosevelt? Does it not show the same unscrupulous methods that induced him to misrepresent before the people of Illinois, when the issue was a vital one, the attitude of President Taft with respect to the seating of Senator Lorimer? Does it not show, too, double-dealing by Mr. Roosevelt on the reciprocity question when he, for political advantage, attempted to repudiate his writings and his speeches not only in favor of reciprocity, but actually in advocacy of free trade with Canada? How can any fair-minded man who is a lover of peace justify Theodore Roosevelt's attitude on the arbitration question in his instructions to Senator Dixon, and to certain other Senators whom he dominated, to repudiate their promise and to vote against the passage of the arbitration treaties? Can any man not unreasonable and unreasoning say that Theodore Roosevelt has given his former friend, President Taft, the square deal?

One of the reasons advanced by the new so-called party in extenuation of its formation is that the Republican party is controlled by bosses. This is, of course, not true; but that designing men in many States have usurped power to the detriment of the party is a deplorable fact. Have not the Democratic, the Prohibition, and the Socialist parties also their political bosses? Bossism is but a detail of a great party's history, and can only be remedied by a more zealous discharge of civic duties by the electorate. Political morality cannot be improved by statutes alone. Moreover, has not Mr. Roosevelt himself been intimately associated in his political career with bosses, and has he not publicly admitted that he has made use of some of the political bosses, whom he to-day denounces, for what he claims to have been the welfare of the country? I do not believe that any new party the creation of which may have been inspired by motives however lofty, by men however upright, would be immune from the taint of bossism, unless men shall more zealously discharge their civic duties for the suppression of political corruption. Surely it is not an auspicious beginning for the Bull Moose party to have at its Cæsarean birth

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

*accoucheurs* notorious for their disreputable political activities.

It has been alleged that the Republican party is dominated by political bosses in the interests of unscrupulous trusts. Now no fair-minded man can accuse the Taft administration of a lack of zeal in the prosecution of offending trusts. Indeed, Mr. Roosevelt himself—and in this respect some of us agree with him—deplores the hyperstrenuosity in this regard of the Taft administration. But, then, how can the assumption of unctuous rectitude by the Bull Moose party be reconciled with the fact that among its most important political factors are many notorious bosses and that its financial backers are well-known trust magnates against whom the Federal Government, under President Taft, has instituted suits? Is it only a coincidence that the trusts now financially promoting the candidacy of Theodore Roosevelt are trusts being prosecuted by the Taft administration? Trusts which during Theodore Roosevelt's administration were regarded as "good" trusts—*i. e.*, trusts friendly to Mr. Roosevelt, and to whom, as "good" trusts, immunity baths were accorded.

Is a new party justified simply because there is and always must be more or less political corruption in public life and in a party organization? What is to prevent such men, when it is to their selfish interests, from gaining a foothold in a new party and carrying on their unscrupulous purpose just as they have always done in all parties from the beginning of history? I object to the self-righteousness that is preached by the leaders of the new party and their libelous arraignment of those who differ with them as to the methods of solving political and ethical questions.

Theodore Roosevelt is, I think, to be regarded as an exhorter, not a statesman; as a politician, not an idealist; as the political Don Juan of the time—"speaks such welcome words and so sincere he seems; vows with such passion, swears with so much grace, that it is Heaven to be deceived by him."

Having eliminated Theodore Roosevelt from the list of candidates for whom I could consistently and conscientiously vote, I shall explain why I cannot vote for Woodrow Wilson.

I shall not discuss Governor Wilson's personal qualifications for the Presidency beyond expressing the opinion that in respect of training and experience they are not com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parable to those of President Taft. Charges have been made and substantiated that Mr. Wilson has on occasions changed the opinions which he had so long held and so ably advocated on fundamentals of governmental policies. Surely this does not show stability of opinion or that reliability of judgment which are characteristics essential to a President of our great nation. Emerson has said that "Consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds." But, nevertheless, the contrary—vacillation—does not inspire confidence. But however well qualified Mr. Wilson might be, he would inevitably be under the influence, indeed, the determining influence, of political advisers who, from the Republican point of view, would not measure up to the great responsibilities that leaders must assume in the administration of our national affairs. Suffice it, then, to say that my political bias would, irrespective of other considerations, prevent my voting for Woodrow Wilson.

Therefore, by the process of elimination, I shall vote for President Taft; but there are other than negative considerations, cogent reasons, indeed, for so doing. President Taft has, I believe, made in the fullest measure a good President. In spite of the disloyalty of a faction of his own party, which was inspired by Theodore Roosevelt to discredit his administration, and in spite also of the obstruction for partisan purposes of the Democratic party, President Taft has accomplished the enactment of more progressive measures than any other President in a single term of office. Permit me to enumerate briefly — space unfortunately preventing the emphasis of comment—some of the notable achievements of the Taft administration.

The economies and efficiency introduced into his administration will especially appeal to all business men and to all taxpayers, as will the following achievements to the general public: arbitration treaty with Great Britain and France; enforcement of Sherman anti-trust law without fear or favor; veto of Democratic wool, cotton, and free-list bills as unfair, unscientific, and destructive of the Republican principle of protection; abrogation of discrimating passport treaty with Russia; postal savings-banks established; railroads prevented from putting rate increases into effect without approval of Interstate Commerce Commission; Panama Canal pushed to early completion without hint of scandal; white-slave traffic practically destroyed; admission of Ari-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

zona and New Mexico to statehood; bureau of mines established to safeguard the lives of miners; American capital and labor benefited by extension of foreign markets; abolition of peonage; income-tax amendment to the Constitution submitted to State legislatures for ratification; boiler-inspection law passed by Congress; bond issue to complete irrigation projects in the West; maintenance and extension of open-door policy in China; peace maintained in Cuba, South and Central America, by friendly warnings and interventions; Government business methods modernized and reformed by economy and efficiency commission, saving millions of dollars annually; non-political methods used in taking the thirteenth census; bucket-shops and get-rich-quick concerns destroyed; parcels post established; new treaty with Japan ending racial controversies on the Pacific coast; further extension of safety-appliance act; Post-office Department made self-sustaining; Canadian reciprocity, rejected by Canada through fear that the United States would derive the benefits; publication of campaign funds and expenditures; indorsement of commission's report and proposed bill concerning employers' liability; reorganization of customs service, corruption eliminated, frauds exposed and punished, and millions of dollars recovered; Court of Commerce to review findings of Interstate Commerce Commission; non-partisan tariff board to report on the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad (this, with the recommendation of tariff revision schedule by schedule, is a most advanced step toward taking the tariff problem out of the sphere of politics); corporation tax yielding $30,000,000 annually; Government examination of corporation methods provided; a deficit of $58,000,000 transformed into a $30,000,000 surplus; non-partisan judicial appointments; further control of railroads through extension of powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; Workingman's Compensation Act brought to successful issue in the Supreme Court; stock and bonds commission; valuable and exhaustive report submitted as basis for legislation; extension of civil service by executive order; practical conservation acts; Court of Customs Appeals, undervaluations stopped, etc.

All this President Taft has achieved without ostentation, and for that reason his splendid record has not impressed itself vividly upon the minds of the people. Nevertheless,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I am confident appreciation of the great work he has accomplished will become general before the campaign is over. There can be no question but that he has been extremely conscientious in redeeming the pledges of the Republican platform, upon which he was elected four years ago, and has accomplished his object with remarkable success. This fact should be conclusive evidence of the earnest efforts he will make to carry out the promises of this year's Republican platform, a platform which meets all immediate requirements of our national development. I would refer the reader to the Republican platform.

Now, as to President Taft's personal qualifications for the high office of the Presidency. No higher tribute could be paid him than that of Mr. Roosevelt four years ago, and any fair-minded American will admit that President Taft has done nothing to justify Mr. Roosevelt's " recall of the opinion " he expressed at that time.

From an intimate friendship which has extended over a period of nearly forty years I have a profound personal feeling of friendship and admiration for William Howard Taft. Experience and acquaintance that I have had with great men of our time in different parts of the world enables me to obtain a proper sense of proportion in my estimate of his character. Briefly my characterization of President Taft is:

All honest and fair-minded Americans, irrespective of political bias, recognize and respect President Taft's integrity of purpose. A remarkable mental poise, a rare judicial temperament lies at the foundation of his character, and this fact was appreciated by the American people long before he was called to the Chief Magistracy. To these characteristics may be added other dominating traits—*i. e.*, inflexibility of purpose, straightforwardness in doing things, and absolute frankness in public and private expressions. In this respect, what a contrast he presents to the nominee of the Bull Moose party! To these qualities those who know him well would add entire subordination of personal interests and motives and, no less, the subordination of partisanship to the general welfare of the nation. Then he has in a conspicuous degree the courage of his convictions, a great and abiding optimism, and a charity toward men only to be matched in the character of the immortal Lincoln. To the qualities I have named, all under the discipline of the re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

markable equanimity to which I have referred, he combines a sincere geniality and a charm of manner that wins admiration and friendship even from those who may be called his political enemies. When I re-read the life of Lincoln, and it is a noble record from which every American—indeed, all nationalities—may draw inspiration, I find myself more and more impressed by the conviction that there has been no other President since Lincoln who could by intellectual skill and moral powers have guided our ship of state with such certainty through the tortuous and treacherous passages of passion and bloodshed to our present happy and united condition. President Taft's inflexible honesty, his unfailing judgment, his knowledge of things military, his industry in essential routine, his patience, his firmness, his unfailing courtesy, his commanding personality would have qualified him for the task which fell to our revered Lincoln, or for any task which calls for a man clear of purpose, clear of mind, a man without fear and without reproach. We have to-day a crisis; happily, one that will not lead to civil war, but one, nevertheless, grave—a situation which requires the domination of a President clear of purpose, clear of mind, without fear, and without reproach.

Let nobody imagine that because the graces of character sit happily upon our President that he lacks the fighting quality. No man, it is true, has less taste for a fight, but once in it, with mind and spirit roused and fixed upon a high purpose, there is in all this world no man more resolute or more dauntless. President Taft carries no chip upon his shoulder; his ways are those of conviction and persuasion when these methods may be made to serve, but under the velvet glove, when the welfare of the nation demands, there is unfailingly the iron hand. And in coming to his purpose no man is truer than he to the broad creed of universal fellowship and universal justice.

This characterization of William Howard Taft will be recognized by his country and by the civilized world long after the ephemeral popularity of those who are now maliciously assailing him.

JOHN HAYS HAMMOND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# WHY I AM FOR WOODROW WILSON

BY JAMES A. O'GORMAN, UNITED STATES SENATOR

I AM for Woodrow Wilson because he is a great American with a profound reverence for our laws and institutions.

I am for him because his political record as Governor of New Jersey and his whole career proves that he has the courage, capacity, and character to meet the responsibilities of the high station for which he has been named by the Democratic party.

I am for him because he will bring to the discharge of his duties an intellectual equipment and a devotion to the public welfare worthy of the best traditions of the Republic.

As probably no other American citizen of to-day, he has been a student of causes and effects. In the optimism of his being he believes that there is no excellence that the United States cannot attain. The nearest route and the safest one, the least disturbing one to such excellence, has been the problem to which he has for years been giving his labor and his thought.

He has studied conditions and the causes of conditions; with a mind all sincere he has researched for the remedies for ills that we all know exist and for the proper regimen for building up the system of the body politic, once the disease has been conquered.

His gropings for truth, for the mysterious formula which the country needed, had been for many years in the cloister of his student home.

When he emerged it was with a convincing earnestness and an old, long politically neglected remedy, told in a language that burned into the hearts of men. The remedy was not his, but another's. It was that proclaimed more than a hundred years before by the father of American Democracy and lay in the immortal words: "Equal and exact justice to all men, special privileges to none."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The people had it all the while, but he, best and most forcibly, by his reasoning and the adaptation of its ultimate significance in all governmental affairs, gave to it a new life, modernized it, and drove it home. In his speeches, in his writings, in his interviews, he has shown how its application to every relation of governmental life would crush the wrongs that exist, smooth away inequalities, restore equality to opportunity, give to manhood its entitlement of justice, and revivify a nation's hope.

By remarkable acclaim he was nominated by the Democrats of New Jersey as their candidate for Governor. By a revolution in political or party leanings he was elected.

Then began the work of the practical man, the transformation of the student, the idealist, into the man of deeds.

We are all familiar with the political status of the state before he became its Chief Executive. The public voice unheeded, a nest-place for corporation vultures, the kennel in which so many things foul in the country were littered, corrupting influences everywhere assailing the rights of the people, he found the strength of Herculean endeavor necessary for the cleansing to which he had pledged himself. Calm, serene, utterly unswervable from the course he had mapped out to make accomplishment follow preachments, he went quietly and effectively ahead. It was not long before the old rulers saw to their dismay that the "schoolmaster" had to be taken at his word, that he meant to do what he declared he would do, and that the man of ideals, the theorist, had developed into a man of courage to perform things and such things as meant their annihilation.

He was obstructed through all the channels known to desperation; he was decried and misrepresented. He stood his ground; offensively and defensively he met them. He announced himself the leader by virtue of his official position in his party and the true champion of all the people.

He had to fight, and he did fight. Behind him lay the cap and gown of the University, and in his hand was the Sword of Authority. When they crowded down upon him, he went away from the office to the source of his power and addressed himself to the people who had chosen him. The battle for a State's regeneration found in him a valiant leader, and the people were behind him. The Legislature which had been elected along with him he held as in a vise to their obligations to their constituents. His reliance upon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the people was to him a tower of strength. "If I shall be chosen Governor of New Jersey," he had said during the campaign, "the people of the State will be the boss—the only boss. I will be your leader, I will be your counselor, your mouthpiece, your policeman, your searchlight. Tell me what you want done in this State, and if that thing isn't done there'll be a big fuss at Trenton and you will know all about it."

The people told him that they wanted to get rid of the old conditions which had for so long oppressed them and degraded their State. They said that they wanted a reform of the election laws to prevent corruption and to make possible more direct popular rule; the better regulation of corporations; a working-men's compensation law; an act to allow cities to adopt the commission form of government; the regulation of cold storage and other acts to promote health.

There were "big fusses at Trenton," as the Governor had promised, and he was ever a central figure. When the legislative session of three months had ended the Governor, "the leader of the people," their "policeman," their "searchlight," had signally triumphed. The system against which the people rebelled had been choked to death by the Corrupt Practices Act, which makes it impossible for any corporation to contribute in any way toward the election of any candidate, and likewise makes the use of money on Election Day impossible.

Government was restored to the people by the enactment of direct primaries for all elective State, county, and municipal offices; by the enactment of direct primaries for United States Senator and delegates to national conventions, with popular expression for choice for President; by the enactment of civil-service tests for election officers and personal registration of all voters; and by non-partisan ballots in both primaries and elections.

Surely it is one thing to be an idealist and quite another to be an idealist and a performer.

As "leader of the people" the better regulation of corporations was insured through a comprehensive Public Utilities Law, fixing the responsibility on officers of corporations for all violations, and vesting power in a commission to make rates and physical valuation of public-service companies.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Accidents to working-men were provided for by a workmen's compensation law, providing for automatic payments for injuries or loss of life in all industries, and doing away with the old and unjust fellow-servant immunity of the common law.

Other legislation comprehending every expressed desire made by the people and every campaign pledge given to them was effected.

Agriculture, pure food, labor, elections, sociology, civil service, conservation, education, taxation, all were looked after in a way that promoted the happiness and welfare of the people of the State. In his appointments of judges and other public officials his standard was high. He insisted upon capacity, efficiency, and character. Race or creed did not qualify or disqualify. Merit alone was the test. He appointed to the Supreme Court of the State Samuel Kalisch. He appointed to the Court of Appeals Mark Sullivan. He appointed to the office of Port Warden of Jersey City Antony Capelli. Those three legislative months constituted a writhing period for the adherents of the old system and the corporations which had so long written laws for the statute-books of the State.

When the end came it was with a clean slate, all promises fulfilled, that the Governor faced a people whom his administration had cheered and whose State it had redeemed. He had brought down to date, as far as in him lay, the principles of the great Jefferson.

It was but natural that, as a result of his efforts in New Jersey, he had attracted the attention of the entire country. It is not strange that when Democrats were looking about for a man worthy in achievement, character, and all the phases of eligibility, Governor Wilson became a commanding figure. He was invited to address legislatures of various States and gatherings of the people in all sections of the country. Indulging never in personalities, a stranger to the acrimonies of politics, he spoke ever with a mind bent upon principles and with an eloquence that never failed to captivate. One of his most notable deliverances was at the Jackson Day dinner, given last January in the city of Washington and attended and participated in by the leading Democrats of the country. His speech was a classic in construction and deliverance and gave added cheer to an already enthused and confident party.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

His declarations in all of his speeches were clear-cut. He was the enemy of privilege, the champion of equality before the law. As the country knows and favors progressiveness, he is a foremost progressive. Yet all of his progressiveness is in direct line with Jeffersonian declarations on the subject which are so plain and simple that he who runs may understand.

As a result those organizations which have grown rich from legislation which gave to them special privileges see in him an enemy. The coteries of capital which have fixed the prices that the consumer must pay for life's necessities are his enemies. Those who regard politics as an opportunity for spoils are his enemies. Those who have long dominated political parties and determined election results by the cruel logic of heavy corruption funds are his enemies. But that his enemies are far less numerous than those who believe in him and the party of which he is the leader is made sure by the well-founded predictions of his overwhelming election.

His nomination at Baltimore came clean. It was not the result of deals or sordid alliances. No corporation influence contributed anything to its consummation. There was no machine behind it. It was a foregone conclusion, despite the long-drawn-out contention of rival aspirants. It came to him as the splendid reward for noble public service. It came to him as the presidency of Princeton University had come, as the Governorship of New Jersey had come, and as the Presidency of the United States shall come. It came to him as the one man in the country best equipped for the leadership of a great party at a crucial time in the nation's history.

That the rank and file of his party are enthused over the nomination no man who observes has doubted. That it was the best possible nomination few now can question.

Ever since the nomination he has naturally been most conspicuously before the public eye. He has made a number of public addresses, which have added to the general estimate of his great value as a factor in the progress of the Republic. His speech of acceptance of the nomination showed how impressed he was with the vastness of service that had been imposed upon him. His subsequent addresses have shown that he is equal to the task of leadership.

There is no evasiveness in what he says. Every utter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ance rings true as truth and establishes the fact that he not only knows what is needed, but how to secure what is needed.

On the tariff he declares that there must be an immediate revision downward so that the evils of the present system shall be eradicated.

On the trusts, on labor, on the high cost of living, on every subject that affects the well-being and happiness of the individual, he is positive and unmistakable.

He declares that "those who buy are not even represented by counsel. The high cost of living is arranged by private understanding."

Governor Wilson knows all the ins and outs by which legislation for the beneficiaries of privilege has been obtained from Republican Congresses. He knows how and whence the various tariff schedules have emanated; that they have been written by interests desirous of benefiting themselves at the expense of the masses of the people. He knows the power of "private understanding."

He will go into office with no sword of vengeance, not to punish, but, as he has put it, "to undertake the great duty of accommodation and adjustment." He will destroy no business, but will seek to prevent monopoly and its attendant wrongs.

Speaking of what, for a better name, he calls "confederacies" of capital, he declares that "laws must be devised which will prevent this if laws can be worked out by fair and free counsel that will accomplish that result without destroying or seriously embarrassing any sound or legitimate business undertaking or necessary and wholesome arrangement." Surely such radicalism is no of a character that honest business should fear a Democratic victory.

Further, along the same line, the Democratic nominee declares: "I am not one of those who think that competition can be established by law against the drift of a world-wide economic tendency; neither am I one of those who believe that business done upon a great scale by a single organization—call it corporation or what you will—is necessarily dangerous to the liberties, even the economic liberties, of a great people like our own, full of intelligence and indomitable energy. I am not afraid of anything that is normal. I dare say we shall never return to the old order of individual competition and that the organization of business



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon a great scale of co-operation is up to a certain point itself normal and inevitable."

Can the man be unfair whose visions come from a mind so healthful?

Governor Wilson's mind is healthful because it has known the touch of no evil contaminations. The patriotic instinct is deeply imbedded in his breast. He is not narrow. He is a broad-minded American, free from racial or religious prejudice. No selfish or sinister influence will direct his policies. Since his boyhood he has been a student of his country's history and its institutions. As the love for a mother is his love for his country and its traditions.

As a student and an author he is known abroad as at home. He has conquered destiny by living an active and upright life, devoting his great talents to the noblest endeavors, and using with courage his vast stores of knowledge to advance truth and strengthen right. He is of the people and for the people, not blatant in demagogy, on the one hand, nor content with the comforts of a meaningless life on the other; but ever working, ever moving to the advancement of progress toward high ideals of government. He believes in political organizations. He believes organized effort is essential in every human activity. As profound in his simplicity as was Jefferson, he is as simple in his greatness as was Lincoln.

In his administration of the Government there will be no scandals; there may be differences of opinion or judgment as to his plans and methods, but he will never fail in the nation's respect. Guided by his purest principles, his walk will be stately and his course true. He will give to the great office the dignity of Jefferson, the courage of Jackson, and surround it with the kindly gentleness that marked the administration of Lincoln.

When the wire flashed to Sea Girt the result of the Baltimore Convention, Governor Wilson was not elated. He did not rejoice in his triumph. Impressed with a sense of the great responsibility which had been laid upon him, he sought strength in the reflection that God and the American people would sustain him in his efforts to meet the just expectations of his countrymen.

He is in thorough touch with his party, and his party is behind him in reassuring solidarity. He will have no "Congress on his hands," but a Congress by his side.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He will respect the wisdom of the Fathers, who divided the functions of government among three independent departments—the legislative, the judiciary, and the executive.

Why not intrust such a man with such a place? Why not put the real leader in charge in such a situation? I believe that the citizens of the country will rally to Governor Wilson.

Speaking as a commissioned representative of the people of my State in the Senate of the United States, I urge my people, those whom I serve, to best serve themselves and best enable me to serve them by voting for Woodrow Wilson for President of the United States. His election will, in my opinion, mean a new era, an era of clean politics, of wholesome laws, of equality in rights and burdens, of pure statesmanship, of the best service from representatives of the people to the people. Thus will the blessings of free government be secured for ourselves and our posterity.

JAMES A. O'GORMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# WHY I AM FOR ROOSEVELT

BY MILES POINDEXTER, UNITED STATES SENATOR

THE question why any one is for Roosevelt involves a consideration not only of Roosevelt himself, but of the Progressive movement which has made him its candidate. It also necessitates an examination of his opponents in this campaign and the influences and purposes they represent.

It is primarily a question of principles, not of men; and as to these principles as well as the candidates the choice is a relative one, and the preference of party is a comparative preference limited to those actually in the field, one or the other of which will certainly supply the next President of the United States.

Why are we against Taft and for Roosevelt? What are the impediments in the Democratic party which blight and deaden its promise of relief? Mr. Taft came into office under a halo of popularity and good wishes from every element of his party. No brighter auspices ever attended an inauguration. Mr. Taft's campaign had been made against the reactionaries and the forces of special privilege in his own party. By the powerful support of Colonel Roosevelt and the progressive elements in the party he had defeated the stand-pat coalition, and in the election which followed he was enthusiastically supported by the independent masses of all parties. The public conscience had been aroused by the war which Roosevelt carried on during his administration against the intrenched powers of corrupt privilege, and they hailed his successor as one pledged to carry on the work of freeing the Government from the tentacles of private interests which had laid hold on so many of its functions. At the same time the reactionaries in the party had not toward him the bitterness they felt for Roosevelt. They welcomed the change. Perhaps the people at the time did not understand this attitude. The public inter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

preted it only as a tribute to Mr. Taft's more suave manner, more diplomatic methods, and did not doubt in the least the new President's faithfulness to the principles and policies for which he had stood in the campaign and to which the people were becoming more and more attached as the issues became clearer. No man can ever attain a more favorable position in human affairs. Undoubtedly he had an opportunity given to but few men in all history to render a great service to the nation and to endear himself and his memory to the people. At least it seemed so then and it seems so now.

But what of the result? Now in the closing year of his administration (and this is said without the slightest prejudice or unkindness and as a mere record of fact) no President ever stood so discredited before the American people as Mr. Taft; none so utterly bereft of substantial political support from any source; none so lacking in popular favor. What has brought about this astounding change? Mr. Taft had been successful as a Cabinet officer under Roosevelt; at least he shared the popularity and success of that administration. Many a man who is a competent assistant or a valuable lieutenant proves himself to be unfitted for responsibility and utterly helpless as commander-in-chief. So it seems in this case. But that does not fully explain the phenomenon. The fact is Mr. Taft in his official capacity seems lacking in that indefinable and highest quality we call *character*.

A brief reference to their official records furnishes the best answer to the question why one is for Roosevelt and against Taft.

One characteristic of Roosevelt is that he is constantly growing and developing. In that respect he is a natural Progressive. Another of his attributes, said to be a characteristic of great minds, is that his chief interest is in the *future* and not in the *past*. In what has come to be known as the Progressive movement different specific issues have been foremost at different times. When Roosevelt was President he, as many other Progressives, had perhaps given but little attention to the new agencies of popular government which have since been most conspicuous. He dealt with conditions as he found them in the Government with the forces at his command. His attention was directed to the raid upon the public lands, and the fraudulent meth-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ods by which vast areas were being stolen from the public domain. With characteristic power he directed the forces of his administration against these land buccaneers and checked, if he did not entirely stop, the orgy of land frauds by which timber, coal, water-power, and agricultural land was being acquired. He espoused the cause of conservation of the natural resources of the nation and advocated a policy by which these essentials of life should be preserved and developed for the use of the people. Likewise he enforced the laws against the adulteration of food and drugs, antagonizing the great interests which were preying upon the health and lives of the people. He waged unceasing war against special privileges in transportation and other public agencies—the principal instrument of monopoly. He exposed and attacked bribery of public officials by the great lawless financial and industrial combinations such as the Standard Oil Company. In all these matters and in his whole administration he was for the people and against the criminal Interests. The people and the Interests know that, and for that reason the people were and are for him, and the Interests did and do hate him with a bitter hatred. Roosevelt made mistakes, but his mistakes were usually of minor consequence. No man who does things can avoid mistakes. Intelligent public opinion knows that and overlooks his mistakes because it has confidence in his sincerity and integrity. He was perhaps unjust to some good and valuable men in public life, but this was due to misunderstanding.

When Roosevelt went out of office he immediately left the country and was out of touch with affairs for a year. During this period was waged the first Progressive battle, involving a change in an agency of government. While Roosevelt was in Africa took place the greatest parliamentary struggle in the history of Congress—to dethrone Cannonism in the House of Representatives. Cannon was a man of great force of character and ability. He was a typical stand-pat reactionary, opposed to progress, who during his thirty-eight years of public life, much of it in positions of great power, has failed to leave a record of a single statute making for the advance or progress of the nation. He was essentially an obstructionist and a powerful defender of the established system in party government and elsewhere. He was Speaker of the House, and in that position considered himself, as he declared, responsible for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the action of his party in the House. He ruled the House as an absolute monarch. He controlled the destinies of every member, having what now seems the astounding prerogative of appointing every committee of the House. He himself was Chairman of the Rules Committee and appointed his colleagues on it. He was far more powerful than the President, and, representing only one Congressional district, it can readily be seen with what a minimum of effort the tariff—and other interests with which he was in sympathy—could keep their hand upon the legislation of Congress. This, of course, was rendered still more secure by the system of *party* government spoken of elsewhere in this article.

Colonel Roosevelt on Inauguration Day, at the request of two of the so-called Republican "insurgents," asked Mr. Taft to help them in the fight they contemplated making to reorganize the House system. Mr. Taft himself had previously encouraged members to organize a fight to defeat Mr. Cannon for Speaker, and many of them went into that fight relying on assurances of administration support. But Mr. Taft changed his mind in this and supported Mr. Cannon throughout the struggle. The President not only failed to aid the Republican Progressives, but attacked them most vindictively on account of their fight against Cannon; and later, on account of their effort to compel a performance of the platform and of Mr. Taft's campaign pledges for a reduction of tariff duties, he sought to punish and humiliate them by a withdrawal of so-called patronage, as was admitted and apologized for in the famous Norton letter.

In the Senate a handful of Republicans, one of the most brilliant groups of men that body has seen for many years—Jonathan P. Dolliver, Robert M. La Follette, Albert B. Cummins, Moses E. Clapp, Joseph L. Bristow, Albert J. Beveridge—made an able and determined fight to amend the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill so as to conform it in some measure, at least, with the party pledges and the promises of Mr. Taft. Instead of aiding them in this fight, strange to say, Mr. Taft sought in every way to embarrass and punish them. The same situation was repeated when the administration caused to be introduced a most reactionary railroad bill, and word was sent around that the President desired it to be passed without amendment Under the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

guise of prohibiting mergers of competing lines, it opened the way for such mergers to be legalized. It established the Commerce Court, allowed appeals to it by the railroad companies, and denied appeals to the shippers. It would have undone the progress of many years in the matter of railroad control. The same group of men in the Senate and an equally courageous group of Progressive Republicans in the House proposed amendments to the bill and succeeded in eliminating some of its worst features. This increased the antagonism of Mr. Taft toward the Progressive members of his party. On the other hand, he took as his counselors the principal reactionary leaders of Congress.

His Cabinet was composed of men most of whom had been strongly against him for the nomination—several of them reactionary Democrats. Through the influence of syndicates interested in acquiring public lands in Alaska and elsewhere, Richard A. Ballinger was appointed Secretary of the Interior as the trustee and guardian of the people's interest in these lands. As a consequence the notorious Ballinger scandal resulted, disclosing an astounding record with reference to patenting coal-lands of immense value in Alaska and the throwing open to entry of valuable water-power sites which had been withdrawn during Roosevelt's administration. In the exposure of these matters and the attempt to justify them the President went to great lengths in approving the conduct of Secretary Ballinger. The Lawler memorandum, the false-dated Attorney-General's report, the burning of evidence in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, were all condoned or justified and are all perfectly fresh in the public mind. These things were attacked and denounced by Progressives in and out of Congress.

On account of the President's attitude toward them from the first of his administration, Progressive Republicans could scarcely have supported him for re-election without a sacrifice of self-respect.

Political party organizations, like every other living organism, are of limited existence. They are formed and, if successful, have their period of growth and power. Then comes the inevitable decline, decay, and death. Principles only survive. The political society which declares for or against certain principles and makes this or that applica-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of them to the affairs of the nation is of uncertain character, with varying leadership, constantly changing environment, of fluctuating honesty and capacity as applied to the mighty work of government. But the two great fundamental principles out of which every political party grows are as permanent as the race itself, constant and unchanging in their action upon political affairs. These two opposing forces are social statics and social dynamics —inertia *versus* movement. It is the universal law applied to politics. Mark Hanna spoke the doom of his particular cult or order of priesthood of the Republican party organization when he declared it to be "stand-pat." By that he will be remembered. In politics as in life itself there must be growth or decay. The world, the universe, is moving, changing, and that part of it which fails to move with the rest is ground to atoms in the mills of the gods. The universal and inevitable natural party division is reaction and progress—an advancing liberal party, a retrogressive conservative party. There is need for both, and as one or the other, with varying degrees of progressivism or reaction adapts itself to the changing needs and conditions of the people, will it endure and hold the reins of power. The party dies; the principle survives.

"Out of the old fields cometh all this new corn."

The present Progressive movement which is sweeping, not only this country, but the whole world, is but the rehabilitation of the democratic principle. It has been kept warm and vigorous in the hearts of the people, but in both the Democratic and Republican organizations it has become so encumbered with party machinery and loaded with the ball and chain of obsolete governmental dogmas that it has ceased to find expression in the Government through either of those organizations. Both parties are verbose in declaring for a government by the people, but the power of the people is so diluted through an indirect choice of officials, a division of the powers of government under the Constitution, and an irresponsible party government wholly outside of the Constitution, that it largely disappears before it is applied to the actual making and administration of the laws. There are as yet but few Americans who openly declare their opposition to democracy or control of the government by the people; but those who do so openly declare

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are increasing in numbers and influence, and there is a great and powerful party working under cover who privately so believe. The taste for luxury and power which enormous wealth creates—especially when that wealth comes from the exploitation of the people—their natural resources, their highways, their tax, tariff, and currency legislation—necessarily more and more creates a desire on the part of the powerful few for class distinction, class privileges.

This growing party is perhaps the crudest and at the same time the most powerful aristocracy in the world. It is undoubtedly true that many of its most influential adherents either secretly or openly desire to keep down the masses of the people to as low an intellectual and political level as possible. Having gained financial and industrial power by the degradation of their employees—by child labor, by under-pay and overwork, as in the woolen-mills in Lawrence, the steel-mills in Pittsburg, the sweat-shops in the cities—they are anxious to increase their power by perpetuating the same conditions. This does not by any means assert that all those who have greatly profited in the remarkable concentration of industry and wealth, particularly during the last twenty years, willingly oppress their employees or are antagonistic to American traditions and ideals. Many are not, and some are aiding in every way they can to improve these social conditions and to preserve political equality. But it is idle to deny that there are many who are wholly out of sympathy with the doctrine of political equality and who assert that the people are incapable of governing themselves. Among these, strange to say, is the President, who asserted that "all the people are not capable of self-government" and that the true theory of government is a "government of the people *by a representative part* of the people." This is the issue, and in opposition to it the Progressive party is pledged to specific measures within the purview of the Government tending toward the physical, intellectual, and political improvement of all the people. It is for a government controlled by all the people. It realizes that the people must act through representatives, but it insists that these representatives must be really and not only nominally chosen by the people and that they must be responsible to the people for the proper administration of office.

Direct legislation, direct nomination, the power of recall,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are some of the principal agencies advocated by the Progressive party as insuring popular choice of officials and promoting faithful administration. The whole programme is based on the assumption that the American people, as a whole, are well capable of self-government. As necessary adjuncts to a continuance of this policy it proposes to widen the opportunities of the masses of the people for education and self-improvement by providing—where the Government has the power to do so, both through the States and through the Federal Government, under the police powers of the States and the supervision of interstate commerce by the Federal Government—for decent wages, wholesome conditions of labor, reasonable hours of labor, and the protection of women and children. As tending toward these ends and as a powerful aid in accomplishing them, it seeks to bring to its aid the unused moral and intellectual influence of women by granting them the suffrage. Many Democrats and Republicans will say they are in favor of these things, but the fact remains that their party organizations have either expressly opposed them or are silent on the subject. Most men in all parties in this country believe that the party as an instrument of government should be controlled by the voters of the party, and yet the fact remains that neither the Democratic nor the Republican party platform declares for any change in the system by which private business and political bosses have controlled the machinery of both parties. The masses of voters in both of these parties find that the same interests, operating through their attorneys and political henchmen, are their party bedfellows, and that through the same system of caucuses, hold-over national committees and chairmen they are controlling the organizations, the conventions, the nominations of both parties. The cuckoo eggs of Big Business have been laid in the Republican and Democratic nests. Warmed by the party strength and hatched into political power, the imposter bird of special privilege has crowded out democracy, taken possession of the nest, and is fed and sustained by the very people upon whom it preys.

At the Democratic convention in Baltimore one great leader had the courage to propose that certain conspicuous representatives of special interests in that convention be striken from its rolls. No more magnificent spectacle of moral courage has been seen in this country than Mr. Bryan,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the face of an angry convention calling these men by name, pointing out their interests, their affiliations with Tammany Hall and other machines and bosses, and demanding that no man should be chosen by that convention whose nomination depended on their vote. His courage brought to his support the public opinion of his party, and yet the machines and the men whose rejection he demanded remained in the convention and voted for Governor Wilson. And, strange to say, the system which enables these men to control the machinery of the party in State and nation and to defy the popular will remains the same, and no proposal to change it in any way is contained in the Democratic party platform.

Likewise, more incisively perhaps, the same bipartisan interests which were attacked by Mr. Bryan at Baltimore demonstrated at the Republican Convention in June at Chicago the system by which they control the machinery of both parties and so choose the President of the United States. That this was made so clear at Chicago as to arrest the attention of the nation was one of the fruits of the victories already gained by the Progressives. By these victories in a number of States the old system of choosing delegates had been supplanted by Presidential primaries, so that a means was afforded of ascertaining the choice of the voters of the party. Entering the campaign late, when many adverse conditions were already fixed, Colonel Roosevelt swept the country in the most remarkable campaign he or any other man has ever made. In great Republican States from Maine to California he was the overwhelming choice of the party. In some States, as in New York, there was only a travesty of a free primary. Thousands who sought to vote were unable to do so because there were no ballots. In other States, as in Ohio, although there was an overwhelming majority of votes cast for Roosevelt, the primary rules not fixed by statute, but by party resolution, were so loose that the old machine was able to repudiate the vote of the people and return delegates at large against Roosevelt. Every opportunity and advantage of this kind to defy the wishes of the party was brazenly seized by the reactionaries in every State where they were in control of the party machinery. In many States the old system still prevailed and delegates were selected as usual without consulting the people. In the Southern States, return-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing no Republican electoral votes and, with one or two exceptions, containing no substantial Republican party, delegates were controlled for Taft by the open and avowed use of Federal patronage. There was never before in the history of the country such a carnival of sale of Federal offices for delegates to a National Convention. Notwithstanding all these handicaps, when the convention assembled, so overwhelming was the sentiment of the party for him, and limited as was the number of States where it was able to operate, a clear majority of the delegates chosen to the convention were for Roosevelt. At this point is made clear the mode of operation of the party machine, controlled by a coalition of business and politics. Under this system a member of the National Committee is more powerful than a Cabinet officer. This committee, chosen in devious and unknown ways, is in absolute control of the convention, can determine its membership, control its political complexion, and name the President of the United States if the party is powerful enough to elect their choice.

In this case they proceeded to exercise this arbitrary power to its full extent with a reckless defiance of public opinion and the votes of the party in regular statutory elections. One amusing excuse some of them made for their conduct was that if the primary elections in Ohio and other States were held over again they would go for Taft—so they proceeded to give the nomination to Taft. Under this pleasant theory no man need feel discouraged over his defeat for office so long as he has the power to seize the office. He could bathe his aching head, restore his spirits, and proceed to take the office on the faith-cure proposition that if the election were held over again he would be elected. It is difficult to see, however, any necessity for holding an election, since a man who has not been a candidate is in a better position than one who was defeated. If he had been a candidate he might have been elected, and it is an easy step to the proposition that he would have been elected and is entitled to the office. It resolves itself into a question of power:

> "The good old rule, the simple plan,
> Let him take who has the power,
> Let him keep who can."

In fact, that is really the proposition of the "Old Guard," and no man who obtains office by such methods can expect

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the people would long respect or recognize his right to it. It means the destruction of law and order and of "liberty under the law." If such a system could prevail it would be the end of popular government. How it is the very antipodes of government by the people is shown by the fact that the majority of this National Committee could not even be elected delegates to the convention, but had been expressly repudiated by the party membership of their States, as Penrose of Pennsylvania, Crane of Massachusetts, Mulvane of Kansas, Rosewater of Nebraska, and many others. These men were never chosen as members of the National Committee by the party membership of any State. They were selected by the party bosses—the delegate from Washington being chosen by three votes and one proxy out of a committee of thirty-nine members. They were mostly chosen four years ago before any of the issues or candidates of this campaign were before the people; and yet under the party system they settled the issues and selected the candidate by arbitrarily making the temporary roll of delegates to the convention, rejecting the legally chosen Roosevelt delegates from Washington, Texas, Arizona, and other States, and substituting their own partisans in the place of them. Of course this temporary membership controlled the temporary organization, including the credentials committee, of which some of the contested delegates were members voting on the contested cases of their colleagues, which was equivalent to voting on their own cases. So the temporary membership controlled the permanent membership and the nomination. That is the system which the Republican and Democratic parties propose to continue, but which the Progressive party has declared against. It proposes, acting by the States, to substitute Presidential preference primaries in every State, so that the only duty or power of a national convention as to the nomination will be to register the verdict of the people just as the Electoral College does.

Mr. Taft's nomination is not a valid one. Colonel Roosevelt was the real Republican nominee. The unopposed success of the policies of the Taft administration and its allies would lead to *violent revolution,* and because of their party system that would be the only remedy. There is a peaceable remedy through the new popular agencies of the *Progressive* movement. It is said that the new party will be subject

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the same evils as the old parties—that it contains bosses and multimillionaires. This criticism would be perfectly sound if the new party were organized on the same principles as the old ones and proposed to continue the same system. It proposes to wholly change the system, and points out the specific constructive remedies by which the boss with his private business allies as a political institution or as a factor in party control will be impossible. The conditions out of which he has grown will be eliminated.

The new party platform alone has specified in definite terms the particular social and political evils which must be removed and has proposed and defined the specific remedies.

The Republican party in its platform admits no social or political distress, dwells upon its past glories, paints a glowing picture of prosperity and of a social and political Utopia which it claims to have created. Admitting no need for progress, asserting, in effect, that present conditions are perfect so far as government can affect them, of course it proposes no remedies.

The Democratic party in its platform deals in vague generalities, eulogizes itself and its record, is wholly silent as to those necessary agencies of popular party government—the direct primary for Presidential as well as other elections. It could not free itself from its dead conservatism, and denies the power of the Federal Government to deal with the monsters of private power which have in so many respects perverted the public functions and the public property to private use and aggrandizement. The Democratic party and Governor Wilson, its candidate, apparently do not realize that these private powers which have established monopolies of meat, iron, sugar, natural oil, transportation, and other necessities are more powerful than any State government and that by the use of modern machinery, of steam and electricity, of the telephone, the telegraph, they hold the continent as in the hollow of their hand, that State lines are as nothing to them, and that it will tax the power of the Federal Government to subject them to the proper control. The Progressive party would in no way minimize the power of the States nor lessen its activity, but it sees that most private interests seeking to prey upon the public and to escape with their public plunder are joining with the Democratic party in its cry against national con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trol. The Progressive party is pledged to the proposition that the whole power of the nation must be exerted to stop and hold in check the exploitation of the nation for private aggrandizement and that the Federal Government should extend its agencies for exercising its constitutional powers.

It would at the same time, by direct election of Senators, Senatorial, and Presidential primaries, the destruction of the machine system of party control, and other popular remedies, restore the control of the Federal Government to the people, so that whatever powers it exercises should be under the people's control and operated in their interest. It is a matter of common observation that the Federal Government and Constitution, which were once jealously regarded as a menace to individual and local liberty, are more and more looked upon and appealed to as the guardian and protector of the citizen. Governments are primarily formed for the protection of the weak against the aggressions of the strong among their own citizens by substituting the regular rule of government and law for mere force directed by passion or avarice and by uniting all in an organized society protecting all against the aggressions of foreign foes. Where there is no great discrepancy of power as between its private citizens, government sits but lightly upon them all, but when some have grown mighty and swollen with power while others have been correspondingly submerged, it becomes necessary that there should be more interposition of government between the two for the restraining of the one and the protection of the other.

In a speech in New York City, September 4, 1912, Governor Wilson spoke against the concentration of power in the Government. He seems to forget that power in this country is already concentrated as it never was before in the history of the world, and that it is concentrated in private hands and that its owners in some instances have shown a willingness to use this power selfishly, brutally, oppressively, criminally. It is a question of unrestrained concentrated power in private hands, or sufficient power in the Government to restrain and control it. Governor Wilson said: "Government by a commission is to remedy nothing, is to create no freedom. It is to perpetuate and license the concentration of control. I shall make war upon that to the utmost of my power."

The Progressive party proposes a Commission, subject

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the control of Congress, to regulate and restrain the so-called trusts. Governor Wilson says he " will make war upon such a proposition to the utmost of his power." That is the attitude of the Democratic party; it is opposed to Federal control and regulation of trusts. No other power can do it. The great corporations must be regulated by the Federal Government or not at all. The choice is between government regulation and a lawless private plutocracy growing constantly greater by unrestrained privilege. The Progressive policy is to strengthen the Sherman anti-trust law by defining what acts constitute a restraint of trade and to strictly enforce it through the proposed Commission. Great combinations of capital must exist. To allow them to be formed and do business for years without interruption and then bring suit for dissolution is illogical and ineffective, as demonstrated by the Standard Oil and Tobacco Trust suits. The Progressive party would subject them to constant Government control, take from them every special privilege which has been the principal means of monopoly, and so leave the way open for competition where competition is needed.

So would the Progressive party avoid the unscientific policy of plunging the entire country into business depression periodically by a wholesale revision of the entire tariff law by Congress. Progressives favor a tariff commission with full power to investigate and to fix rates, just as the Interstate Commerce Commission has power to fix railroad rates—upon a principle laid down by Congress and subject to its control. In accordance with its general policy of negation and opposition to new agencies in the Federal Government the Democratic party is opposed to this also.

In the last sixteen years every other great civilized country in the world has been far more progressive than the United States. The British Government is more popular than ours. It is responsive and responsible to the people, while ours is not. Their House of Commons is supreme. No vote of king or court can stand between the statute of the people and its execution. The " boss " as a political institution and his corrupt alliance with privilege-seeking private interests is unknown in England. He is peculiar to and indigenous in the United States. In no other country except the United States does there exist the extra-constitutional government by party organization, parallel and



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

collateral to, but outside of and yet controlling the constitutional government. This extra-constitutional government is in turn controlled, under the system which the Progressive party is seeking to destroy, by the "boss" and the Interests. So it is that Mr. Archbold, indicted by a grand jury, says he is used to it and treats it as a joke. These powers, defying the law, are intrenched in the machine control of the extra-constitutional party government and fortified in the citadel of indirect elections, hold-over legislators, Presidential and judicial vetoes, of the constitutional Government. We are for Roosevelt because he is the aggressive and forceful candidate of the only party which proposes to attack the intrenchments and carry the citadel; to abolish the "boss" and to bring the Federal Government into the more direct control and the more active service of the people.

The Constitution was formed in a period of jealousy of the central power and when there was but little need for affirmative interference by the Government in the affairs of its citizens. There were then no great private powers. The fathers of the Republic were progressive in their day, but they could not provide the details of conduct for all the future. If such men were our contemporaries they would be leaders in the Progressive movement. This movement is for the preservation of their work. In their day a vast virgin continent lay to the West. Everywhere there was independence and opportunity for the enterprising. The great central feature of our national growth has been the westward movement. It has molded our national character and largely affected our laws and institutions. But within the lifetime of men now living the West has been settled, and now there is no more West in the sense we have known it. The public land is largely occupied. The frontier is gone and great cities stand guard at the gates of the Pacific. Beyond that there is no more West, but the East. We are not only at the end of the continent, but at the end of the world. There never will be again for the human race the opportunities we have had and perhaps still have. There never will be again the responsibilities that rest upon us. "That work," said Cicero, "in which mankind approaches nearest to the divinity of the gods is in founding new states or in preserving those which are already founded." The hope of the world is centered here. We are now in these issues that have slowly been taking form in the heritage

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of time and which at this hour have reached an acute and critical stage—to determine the course of civilization.

Let it not be sung:

> "The star of hope shone brightest in the West,
> The hope of liberty, the last, the best.
> Alas, that, too, has sunk upon her darkened shore
> And hope and freedom light up Earth no more."

More and more by the inevitable law of nature and by our own inventions we have been drawn together as one organism. We are but as a hive of bees, each dependent on the community. What affects a part affects the whole.

Our Government must continue to have life and the principle of growth if it is to stand the test of the new times. It is the result of growth and constant change. The seed came from England. It grew in the new soil of the colonies and adapted itself to the new land. There was the period of revolution, war, and independence. There was the period when out of all of these earlier experiences and heritages the Constitution was framed. All of the priceless guarantees of individual liberty in the Bill of Rights are the result of change and amendment to that instrument. There was the long period of construction of the instrument, of John Marshall's molding of the untried Constitution, of debate, and finally civil war to determine its terms and limitations. The problems which confront us now arise out of conditions which have developed since the war and were unknown to the framers of the Constitution. They cannot be settled as the Democratic party would have us do, by the dogmas of their day. We have modern powers to deal with who "knew not Joseph." The fathers could not have foreseen these conditions, because they arise from agencies of transportation, communication, and manufacture invented after them.

We are confronted by mighty and unprecedented problems involving the liberties of the people. May it be said of us as Washington wrote to Rochambeau: "We have dwelt together, as brothers should, in harmonious friendship and have been co-laborers in the cause of liberty."

MILES POINDEXTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# "THE BIG THREE," 1905–1912

BY SYDNEY BROOKS

As an English policy-holder in the Mutual Life of New York, as well as in a British company of equal standing, I was interested in the storm that seven years ago burst upon the world of American life insurance. It had by no means abated when early in 1906 I chanced to find myself in New York. I could not, indeed, have timed my visit more happily had I crossed the Atlantic for the express purpose of witnessing the American public in one of its periodical fits of morality. "A Frenchman or an Englishman," says Mr. Dooley, "cleans house be sprinklin' th' walls with cologne; we Americans chop a hole in th' flure an' pour in a kag iv chloride iv lime." New York in the early months of 1906 reeked of chloride of lime. Largely, it may be remembered, as the result of a strife of factions and personalities among the directors of the Equitable, the New York State Legislature appointed a committee to investigate the affairs of all the New York insurance companies, and especially of the "Big Three"—the Mutual, the Equitable, and the Life. These three organizations had at that time (in round figures) 2,150,000 policy-holders, their admitted assets amounted to $1,250,000,000, their outstanding insurances to $4,975,000,000, their premium incomes to over $205,000,000, and their combined surpluses to nearly $200,000,000. Their size and power and wealth, the immensity of the interests committed to their care, and the fact that all three companies had expanded beyond the limits of the United States and were doing a considerable business in England and throughout Europe, combined to rivet a world-wide interest on the abuses that were brought to light.

This interest was, naturally, greatest in New York, and it was in New York also that it assumed its most unreasoning and hysterical forms. For weeks and months the yellow

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

press battened on the evidence that was laid before the committee, magnified and distorted every irregularity, hinted at a hundred others for which no corroboration could be found, and succeeded in working both the public and the Legislature up into a state of sheer panic. That many and undoubted shortcomings were disclosed in the working of these vast institutions is as true as that they were adjudged guilty of innumerable crimes they had never committed. Nothing, indeed, could have been more recklessly devastating than the way in which the press and the Legislature turned every insurance company upside down in their search for "graft." Transactions that were not only perfectly regular and legitimate, but were seen to be so by every business man of common sense, became transformed in the imagination of sensational reporters into sinister swindlers; to be an official in any life-insurance company was to be a suspected person; the great services which the "Big Three" had rendered to the community were forgotten; even their solvency was only grudgingly admitted; all sense of proportion and fair play appeared to have departed from the investigators and their allies in the press; and the New York State Legislature proceeded with astounding rapidity and an almost total absence of reflection to enact a series of laws that revolutionized nearly every detail of the life-insurance business. Some of these laws have undoubtedly done good, and no one to-day, whether a policy-holder or a director in the "Big Three," would dream of repealing them in bulk. Others, however, were far too drastic, were conceived in a spirit of suspicion and vindictiveness, have brought forth little but confusion and harm, and, like most laws passed in a panic, have even militated here and there against the very interests they set out to protect.

I have said that some unquestionable abuses were laid bare in the management of the New York companies. Grossly exaggerated and misunderstood as they were, the defects disclosed were none the less real and serious. An excessive concentration of power in the hands of one or two men was, in my belief, at the root of them. Seven years ago each of the "Big Three" was under the direction of a virtually unchallenged autocracy. This meant in practice that both the policy-holders and the boards of trustees and the subsidiary committees were kept far too much in the dark as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the administration of their companies; that extravagance and nepotism found a fruitful soil; that the salaries of the executive offices had risen to an unwarrantable height; and that the personal, political, and financial affiliations of one or two individuals, and the effects produced in them by the long possession of unrestrained power, implicated the entire company and the interests of thousands upon thousands of policy-holders. Any one who to-day calmly re-reads the evidence given before the Armstrong Committee will, I think, agree that the main source of the malpractices revealed was the system that permitted the presidents of the great insurance companies to become little less than despots. A certain ethical laxity or confusion, a dimming of the fiduciary sense, and the formation of entangling alliances with politics and with Wall Street were the all but inevitable results of the faulty conditions that made each president a petty Tsar and insensibly encouraged him to believe that the company was—himself. But apart from this not a few shortcomings were brought to light that were rather technical than personal. Thus it was pretty clearly established that both the annual and deferred dividends payable to policy-holders had seriously diminished, that the mania for size had entailed the expenditure of disproportionate sums on obtaining new business, and that the whole system of deferred dividend policies, with its inevitable accumulation of vast sums for long periods without account, encouraged extravagance and had proved, in spite of its popularity, a disappointing form of insurance from the standpoint of the policy-holder.

It was eminently right that these defects should be exposed and remedied, even if the exposure involved a needless convulsion and even though some of the remedies suggested were planned on far too exacting a scale. The shock administered to the "Big Three" would have overwhelmed any institutions less securely founded or less ably built up; it staggered them even as it was; but it has turned out, on the whole, a salutary experience. For one thing, the investigation brought into clear relief the magnitude of the social service rendered to the American people by the "Big Three" in spreading the gospel and practice of life insurance over an unprecedented area and with unprecedented effectiveness. For another, it proved up to the hilt that, in spite of admitted irregularities, the solvency of each and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all of the companies was beyond the possibility of being questioned, and that the actual losses sustained by the individual policy-holder through wasteful administrative methods, excessive salaries, and so on were so infinitesimal as to be negligible. For a third, the investigation showed that each of the "Big Three" had been conducted with a financial success in the matter of investments that argued managerial ability of the very first order. Moreover, the aftermath of the turmoil of seven years ago has proved equally advantageous to the moral as well as the material health of the companies. It is not too much to say that every specific shortcoming then revealed has been remedied and that every practice which the Legislature condemned has been abandoned. The "Big Three," as a matter of fact, did not wait for the Legislature to speak before proceeding to set their houses in order. At the very outset of the disclosures each company appointed an investigating committee of its own that made an exhaustive and unflinching inquiry into all departments; the officials responsible for the slackness and malpractices of the past were got rid of, boards of trustees were reorganized, great savings were immediately effected, and a spirit of economy and reform which has never slackened for a moment in the intervening seven years quickly made itself felt. The ambition to be big at any cost has been wisely foregone, and each company instead has devoted itself to furnishing the soundest insurance at the lowest price, with the result that each of the past six years has shown in the case of the Mutual, the Life, and the Equitable, a progressively increasing bonus. The administrative machinery of all three offices, again, has been thoroughly overhauled, and it is now impossible for any man to reach the position of autocratic irresponsibility occupied by the presidents of the old régime, or to fix salaries or order payments to be made without the full knowledge and sanction of the proper committees. Apart, therefore, altogether from legislative compulsion, the three leading life-insurance companies of the United States have striven earnestly and successfully to effect their own redemption.

That the laws passed by the New York State Legislature in 1906 have assisted this process of reformation cannot be doubted. I do not profess to be able to discuss them as an expert, but in my capacity as an average interested policy-holder in one of the "Big Three," and after plow-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing through most of the available material, I have reached certain rough-and-ready conclusions which I venture to submit as, at all events, fitting subjects for debate. The Legislature, then, in my judgment, did well, on the whole, though not without risk to that very important and beneficent branch of insurance which concerns itself with impaired and substandard lives, in forbidding the further issue of deferred-dividend and non-participating policies. It did well, again, in prohibiting investments in, and loans secured upon the collateral of, ordinary industrial shares; in making syndicate participations and transactions on joint account illegal; in forbidding contributions for political purposes, and in requiring a complete registration of all lobbyists and agents employed by the companies, together with an itemized account of their expenses and services; in compelling an annual distribution of dividends; and in establishing a criterion for reasonable and profitable expenditure on new business. On the other hand, the fact that the laws have already had to be amended some twenty times bears witness to the precipitate and Draconian spirit in which they were enacted. The Legislature, as it seems to me, was ill advised when it set a limit on the amount of insurance that might be written in a given year—a provision since modified by amendment; when it interfered with the legitimate discretion of the companies' officers by laying down not only how much they might spend on procuring new business, but how they should spend it; when it ordered all life-insurance companies to dispose of their holdings in stocks by December 31, 1911—an injunction that was extended last autumn just in time to avert a difficult financial and legal crisis; when it forbade the companies to grant pensions to their employees; when it limited the amount of the contingency reserve that a company might hold to from twenty to five per cent. of its policy liabilities—the largest company being restricted to the perilously narrow margin of five per cent.; when it issued a "standard form" of policy which must necessarily, in such a progressive business as life insurance, prove hampering and illiberal in its operation; and when it devised a scheme of voting by policy-holders for the election of trustees and directors which may fairly be said to have proved an expensive and unworkable farce.

One benefit, however, was conferred by the legislation of 1906 which offers no target for criticism, the benefit of an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unsparing and microscopic publicity. The workings of the "Big Three" are now conducted in a positive blaze of light. Not only are they liable at any moment to be called upon to throw open all their books and accounts to the inspection of the State Superintendent of Insurance, but the annual reports required from them furnish a vast number of particulars that the Board of Trade never demands from any English company. I am, as I have said, insured both in an American and a British company. I have implicit confidence in each, but I find I can only learn about a tenth as much of the affairs of the British concern as I can of the American. In the annual statement which the New York companies are bound to supply to the State Superintendent, and in the various schedules attached to it, more information is contained than is obtainable, perhaps, in regard to any other life-insurance companies in the world. Besides an exhaustive balance-sheet and gain-and-loss exhibit, every piece of real estate owned by each company is set forth in detail, together with the date of its purchase, the name of the vender, the actual cost, the book value, the market value, the increase or decrease by adjustment during the year, and the gross and net income, taxes, repairs, and expenses for each of the past three years. Another schedule shows the amount of real estate acquired during the twelve months. Mortgages and bonds are treated with the same particularity; the securities sold and bought during the year are itemized one by one with an equal fullness of detail; the balances carried in banks and trust companies are displayed from month to month throughout the year; the names, addresses, and services of every person, firm, or corporation in receipt of salaries or compensation of over $5,000, and of all the officers and directors, with their emoluments, are likewise recorded; all salaries paid for agency supervision are set forth on a separate schedule; all legal expenses and all expenses in connection with legislative bodies and officers or departments of government during the year, together with a summary of the occasion of the expense, are similarly detailed; the annual rates of dividend declared in the year on all classes of policies, and the amounts set apart or provisionally ascertained or calculated or held awaiting apportionment on deferred-dividend policies for various terms and of various ages are also stated; and other schedules show the premiums, margins, and expenses

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the first year of insurance and for the company's total business. It is safe to say that, so far as the interests of the policy-holders can be safeguarded by enactments, and so far as publicity is a protection against irregularities, the New York insurance companies stand to-day on a better footing than any of their competitors either at home or abroad. There is nothing that throws a light of any value upon their condition and operations that they are not compelled to publish every year.

It is interesting to see how the "Big Three" have fared under the combined influence of reform from within and pressure from without; and perhaps the fairest and readiest method of ascertaining the extent and character of their progress is to compare the annual reports for 1905 with those for 1911. In the case of the Equitable, however, there has been within the past seven years a fundamental change of constitution that cannot be assessed in figures alone. It used to be a proprietary concern owned by a small stock company, the shareholders in which had alone the right to vote for directors; it has now secured the permission of the Legislature to convert itself into a purely mutual society. This is an important and auspicious development, as it puts an end to dangers that are sometimes apt in America to become extremely formidable—especially the danger of a raid or attack from some financial interest—and also because it dissolves connections that are liable to be at least as compromising as they are useful. The New York Equitable has done, perhaps, more than any other society in the world to popularize and liberalize life insurance; and its founder and for forty years its dominating personality, the late Mr. Henry B. Hyde, was in his way a man of real genius. But the arrangement that placed it under the control of a stock company began to disclose its perils and inconveniences soon after Mr. Hyde's death; efforts to mutualize the society were defeated by the courts; and though Mr. Ryan's acquisition of a controlling interest in the stock, his vesting of the voting power in a board of trustees composed of ex-President Cleveland and two highly reputable and conservative colleagues, and his subsequent disposal of his holdings to Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan at practically cost price, safeguarded the accumulated funds as nothing else could have done and were actions dictated by the best interests of the society, still it is all to the good that the whole

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

system of stock control, with its temptations, its anomalies, and its undesirable opportunities, should have been swept away and that the Equitable should now be managed through its policy-holders alone and should no longer be exposed to the difficulties of a divided interest.

But this, though the greatest, is not by any means the only reform that has been effected in the administration of the Equitable during the past few years. The heads of the opposing groups whose struggles precipitated the revelations of 1905 were impartially eliminated; an independent and extremely vigorous president was brought in from the outside in the person of the late Mr. Paul Morton; and under the direction of his energetic good sense, backed up by the universal confidence inspired throughout the United States by Mr. Cleveland's association with the Board of Trustees, a thoroughgoing policy of economy and reform was instituted and is still being pursued and extended by Mr. Morton's successor. A comparison between the position of the society at the end of 1905 and at the close of last year shows that the total assets have risen by all but $100,000,000, the total surplus by over $20,000,000, the bonuses paid to policy-holders by nearly $6,000,000, the total amounts paid to policy-holders by $15,000,000, the gross earnings from interest and rents by over $5,000,000, and that the average gross rate of interest from investments has increased from 4.3 per cent. to 4.52 per cent., while the total expenses, in spite of the growing pressure of State and Federal taxation, have fallen by over $3,000,000. Before 1906 an increasing volume of business was accompanied by diminishing returns to the policy-holders and excessive expenditure in salaries, commissions, and in obtaining new business. Since 1906 the volume of business has contracted, while the bonus has shown a yearly increase, economy has supplanted wastefulness, and the expenses for new business to-day are less than a quarter of the total insurance expenses. In 1911 the society issued fewer policies than in 1905, received some $6,000,000 less in premium income and over $11,000,000 less in total income, and wrote some $13,000,000 less of new insurance. At the beginning of the present year its outstanding insurance was some $52,000,000 less than at the end of 1905, and the number of policies on the society's books was proportionately lower. This decrease, while in some ways regrettable, is also a sign of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

health and a token that the Equitable is now more concerned to furnish sound insurance at the lowest cost than to make a parade of size. Taken in conjunction (1) with the increase of over $15,000,000 in the loans secured by mortgages and of nearly $45,000,000 in the loans on the society's own policies, (2) with the greatly increased holdings of bonds which now by themselves exceed the value of all the securities held in 1905, (3) with the decrease in the amounts on deposit in banks and trust companies, and (4) with the large falling off in the agents' debit balances, it is a proof of more intimate relations between the policy-holders and the society and of the more thrifty and business-like spirit in which its affairs are now conducted.

In the case of the Mutual Life of New York, which has never had any shareholders and has always been a mutual concern, the particular constitutional problem which confronted the new management of the Equitable did not arise. Many changes of personnel, however, have taken place since 1905, and under the presidency of Mr. Charles A. Peabody, formerly a partner in a New York law firm of first-class standing and a man universally esteemed for his character and his level-headedness in affairs, the company has made a sincere and successful effort to get back to the position it occupied in the early eighties, when no American insurance company, I believe, stood higher, or deserved to stand higher, in both popular and expert opinion at home and abroad. Various circumstances combined for a time to retard the Mutual's recovery from the upheaval of 1905. For one thing the first election for the board of trustees held under the new laws was the signal for a determined and not over-scrupulous attempt, on the part of certain outside interests in America, to gain control of the company—an attempt that, while easily frustrated, attracted a wide publicity and kept all the policy-holders in a state of anxious apprehension. For another, the yellow press, among a thousand other baseless imbecilities, industriously spread the report that Mr. Peabody was the nominee of Mr. Rockefeller, or at least the representative of the Standard Oil group of financiers. It was a mere canard and died a natural death in less than a year of its unnatural birth; Mr. Peabody met it promptly, publicly, and squarely; not a single one of his acts as president has been, or, so far as I know, can be, pointed to as lending it even the shadow of confirmation; and when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I inquired into the matter last year among insurance, financial, and business circles in New York I found it to be not merely discredited, but forgotten. Nobody with any knowledge of easily accessible facts questions for a moment to-day that the new management of the Mutual has not only proved of signal advantage to the policy-holders, but is absolutely untrammeled by any illegitimate external influences or connections.

Of the other benefits that have accrued in the past few years a comparison between the annual statements of 1911 and 1905 yields some interesting evidence. One notes, for instance, as a sign of increasing confidence a large increase in the bonuses applied to purchase paid-up additions and annuities or left with the company to accumulate at interest. The bonuses paid out in cash to policy-holders last year amounted to over $13,500,000, an increase of some $12,000,000 over the figures of 1905; and all together the policy-holders in 1911 received over $20,000,000 more than in 1905. The total amount derived from interest and rents is to-day some $5,000,000 more than it was seven years ago, and the success of the new administration is amply shown by the fact that the total income has been brought back to the height it reached in 1905, while the admitted assets of the company are nearly $120,000,000 more. A saving in expenses that amounts to well over $5,000,000 has been effected in commissions, salaries, the inspection of risks, law costs, and advertising; and the stricter methods of bookkeeping and the keener sense of responsibility that now obtain are visible in the rigorous scaling down of the $5,000,000 that figured in the statement of 1905 under the item of "real-estate valuation adjustments." The ledger assets of the company in the two years exhibit, indeed, some remarkable differences, the real estate held in 1911 being considerably less, while the mortgage loans, the book value of the bonds, and the loans to policy-holders have very greatly increased. Deposits on interest in trust companies and banks have been steadily reduced; the company owns $13,000,000 worth of stocks less than it did; and it has abandoned the practice of issuing loans secured by the ordinary collateral of the money-market. Like the Equitable, the Mutual wrote fewer policies in 1911 than in 1905, representing a difference of roughly $40,000,000 of insurance, and its outstanding insurance at the end of last year

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was some $85,000,000 below the figures of 1905. Skilful investment has enabled it to earn on its accumulated funds the remarkably high interest of four and three-fourths per cent.; and the conservative spirit that now animates the company was strikingly shown when the trustees decided not to avail themselves of the permission of the Legislature to write more than $150,000,000 of new insurance in any one year, but to fix on that sum as the figure beyond which they would not go. Of late the Mutual has led the entire world of insurance in devising sound, liberal, and ingenious schemes for meeting the needs of policy-holders who have been compelled to discontinue the payment of their premiums and in formulating an attractive series of options open to beneficiaries on the death of the insured. No company, indeed, has done more to make the interests of its policy-holders the guiding principle of its whole policy and administration.

The New York Life Insurance Company has long been the biggest of the "Big Three." The most rapid period of its growth was between 1885 and 1905, when both its premium income and the amount of its outstanding insurance were multiplied nearly sevenfold. This stupendous increase in the volume of business was due partly to the company's initiative in issuing unrestricted policies and to its being the first concern in America to undertake the insurance of sub-standard lives on a large scale, and partly to its abolition of general agencies and the substitution therefor of the branch-office system. But both its size and its *modus operandi* exposed it to the full force of the legislation so hastily passed in 1906. No company, indeed, was harder or more ruthlessly hit by the restrictions suddenly placed on the amount of new business that might be procured. In 1905 it issued policies carrying nearly $300,000,000 of insurance, or twice the amount which the Legislature in 1906 decreed might be written in any future year. The company was, therefore, obliged to dismember its entire organization. Between the end of 1906 and the end of 1909, 135, or considerably over half, of its branch offices had to be closed and nearly 3,000 agents left its service. Happily, it possessed, and still possesses, in Mr. Darwin P. Kingsley a president who both intellectually and by reason of his virile personality is the strongest individual force in American insurance to-day. A man of broad, sane, and clear-cut

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

views, combining the executive and the reflective faculties in a quite unusual degree, with a fervid faith in the social benefits of insurance, and endowed with a remarkable gift of expression by both pen and tongue, Mr. Kingsley has proved himself at once the ablest defender and the fairest and most formidable critic of the laws adopted by the Legislature after the Armstrong investigation. Without denying that the inquiry revealed "conditions which cannot be defended on any theory of business or on any theory of morals" and resulted in "enormous public benefits," and while freely admitting that "many of the laws written at that time were good and should be retained," Mr. Kingsley has consistently, and to a large extent successfully, protested against the legislative limitation on the amount of new business, the legislative restriction of the contingency reserve to five per cent. of the outstanding insurance, and the legislative regulation of the method—as apart from the amount—of expenditure in procuring new business. It was due almost wholly to his candid and persevering campaign, conducted all but single-handed, that the Legislature in 1910 modified the first of these three hampering provisions. The other two, however, still remain.

A comparison of the figures put forward in the exhaustive annual statements for 1911 and for 1905 reveals, in the case of the New York Life, results very similar in kind to those already discussed in connection with the Equitable and the Mutual. For all three companies the past six years have been a period of retrenchment and consolidation. All three have effected great changes in the personnel, the administrative methods, and, above all, in the spirit of their organization; all three have shown signs within the last two years of recovering from the tremendous shock they sustained in 1905 and 1906; and with all three a reduction in the volume of business has gone hand in hand with a still greater reduction in expenses and with rapidly increasing returns to their policy-holders. The New York Life, however, is the only one that has succeeded in recovering all the ground that was lost. It wrote, it is true, in 1911 only about half as many policies as in 1905 and for an amount nearly $120,000,000 less; but it had at the end of last year a larger number of policies in force, representing a greater amount of insurance, than was the case at the end of 1905. What, however, is far more important is that its methods

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have shown a simultaneous improvement in carefulness and economy, and that the returns to policy-holders under all heads, and the average rates of interest earned on bonds, mortgages, and real estate have steadily and year by year increased. In 1911, for instance, the company paid to its living policy-holders nearly $30,000,000 and over $25,000,000 in death claims—an excess of some $15,000,000 over its disbursements under these two heads in 1905. Both its income from premiums and its total income at the end of last year were actually greater than at the end of 1905—a result due partly to more skilful investments and partly to a scrupulous reduction of expenses. For every $5 which the New York Life received last year it paid out $1.10 on death claims and $1.40 to living policy-holders and set aside $2.02 for reserve and dividends. Of the remaining 48 cents 20 went to agents, 14 to branch-office expenses, agency supervision, and medical expenses, 10 for administration and investment expenses, and 4 for taxes, licenses, and fees. That is a remarkable showing; it indicates how effectually the New York Life has sought economy through efficiency without losing its old capacity for militant enterprise.

To sum up. The tumult of 1905 called a six years' halt in the growth of the three companies that are by far the largest not only on the American continent but in the world. But each company has turned the interval to account by inaugurating a rigid policy of internal reform, has improved the character and yield of its investments, has greatly diminished its expenses, has revolutionized its administrative methods and arrangements, and has added year by year to the returns to its policy-holders. By forbidding investments in stocks and by prohibiting the issue of deferred-dividend policies the Legislature has forestalled the recurrence of conditions that in the old days were fertile in abuses and temptation. One-man power, as it existed in the time of the McCurdys, the Alexanders, the Hydes, and the McCalls, has been definitely demolished; committees to-day really supervise and directors really direct; and in all the transactions of the companies and in their daily routine there is visible a responsibility and carefulness and a sense of what it is that constitutes trusteeship that mark a complete departure from the loose procedure and looser ethics of the pre-1905 period. The greatest of all the reforms that have been effected in the conduct of the "Big

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Three" is one that cannot be tabulated or measured in dollars and cents; it is precisely this transformation of the standards, outlook, and ideals of those responsible for their management—a transformation, I should say, that is far from being confined to the insurance companies, and that, under the pressure of an increasingly vigilant and sensitive public opinion, is visible and operative in almost every department of American business and finance. Therein lies the best and most effective security against the possibility of such abuses as were disclosed in 1905 again creeping into the administration of the "Big Three." The basis on which they are now established is sounder than it ever was before; the air has been cleared; the altered perspective and the improved and more economical methods have restored public confidence; and I see no reason why the future of American insurance should not be as useful and as striking as its past and considerably more wholesome. There remain, however, three special difficulties with which the American companies have still to contend. One is the increasing and reckless pressure of State and Federal taxation; another is the animus against large corporations which now seems to obtain all over the United States and which may before long assume a radically hostile and repressive form without much regard to the purposes for which any given corporation exists; the third is the amazing system which makes every insurance company play the part of shuttlecock to the whims and ignorances of nearly fifty States, each with its own Superintendent of Insurance and its own code of insurance legislation. To persuade the Supreme Court to bring insurance under the Interstate Commerce clause of the Constitution and to replace the chaotic rule of the States by the sane and orderly regulation of the central and national authority are reforms that seem to me, as an English policy-holder in an American company, eminently desirable. There are still, therefore, some rocks ahead of the "Big Three," but neither in kind nor in effect are they to be compared with the troubles in which the companies had involved themselves seven years ago and from which they have at length safely, and as I believe permamently, emerged.

SYDNEY BROOKS.



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THIS ASTONISHING NATION

BY R. A. SCOTT-JAMES

He was a tall, active, eager man, and his face bore a ludicrous resemblance to that of Mr. W. B. Yeats. He was a citizen of Detroit, and Detroit seemed to have absorbed his personality and taken him to itself.

"Have you an aquarium in London?" he asked, and scarcely waited till I asked if his own city was thus privileged.

"Oh my, yes, with real live salt-water fish. You've never been to Detroit? I reckon you've missed the finest city in America. There are very fine streets in Detroit; fine parks, avenues, rivers, canals, hotels, theaters, public buildings. . . ."

The catalogue ran on rapidly and inexhaustibly. "Have you got zoological gardens in London? Quite a number of fine beasts in Detroit: bears—grizzly bears, polar bears, black bears, brown bears, and wolves, jackals, hyenas, jaguars, spotted zebras. And what about chemical works in London? In Detroit? Oh, sure! The largest chemical works in the world. I've quite a number of fine views which I'd like you to see."

I was allowed to gaze upon the spacious splendors of this city as represented in forty or fifty colored post-cards carefully addressed to my patriotic friend and inscribed, "Lovingly, Monica."

I regret that I have never been to Detroit and never seen this genial, eloquent, whole-hearted citizen in his proper Detroitian setting. And I have never been to Chicago, nor to San Francisco, Columbus, nor St. Louis, nor any of those Far Western cities every one of which is unique. In fact, I have been to America and missed seeing most of it. I never saw the Rocky Mountains nor the Colorado Desert nor the flood of the Mississippi, in which respect, it is true,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I resemble most of the inhabitants of eastern America. The territory, after all, is varied as well as large. The surface of it has been scratched in many places and in many ways, and the casual visitor must rely on what has been thrown conspicuously into view. One might almost as well describe one's impressions of the world as one's impressions of America.

We do not, of course, recollect our first impressions of the world; but if we imagine a well-educated gentleman from Mars versed in the literature of our planet, arriving here on a journey for business or pleasure, we may be sure that his first impressions would be vivid. He would think it well, perhaps, to postpone any pronouncement for a few days or weeks. Having descended upon Central Africa, he might hesitate to conclude that the civilization of this region was characteristic of our planet; he might withhold judgment until he had seen Peking and Detroit or even New York and London. But in any case his impressions would be interesting. He would do for the world what Mr. Wells, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hueffer, *et hoc genus omne* have done for America—he would arrive naïvely and famously among us; he would write a book entitled *You Worldlings* which would be eagerly read; he would win the credit of drawing from us a sort of planetary consciousness, a proud belief that we were all citizens of the world, of exciting our orbic *amour propre* till we were disposed to defend our fellow-worldsmen in the South Seas should he criticize their habit of tattooing. It might almost seem that Cairo was beginning to tolerate London and London ceasing to be jealous of Chicago on the day when this outspoken Martian challenged us all to community of feeling.

My own arrival in New York was unheralded. Indeed, I had been preceded by other Englishmen whose strange appearance in that city had occasioned as much excitement as the citizens could spare. But this did not check in me an uncanny feeling as if I had suddenly alighted upon the world. It was an actual fact that I had been living for years on a foggy island somewhere in the region of the Gulf Stream, an island full of old ruins and picturesque historical objects still inhabited but removed by nearly three thousand miles from the Continent—I mean the Continent of America. I was face to face with two-legged Americans who politely and at once asked me, " What do

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

you think of us?'' "How do you like us?'' "Is this at all what you expected?'' It was not. I distinctly remember the first emotions of bewilderment and desolation, and the real relief I experienced on glancing at my legs and appreciating the fact that I also had two of them—that at least in this respect I resembled them. I record it as an unimportant but psychological fact that I was overjoyed at possessing the same number of legs as the average American.

It is a great thing to start from some point of community. I was glad that I could do so, for from the first I found myself out in all my reckonings, a stranger in a land extraordinarily foreign. Like everybody else in England, I had thought that I knew all about America without going there. I had taken my lesson from the American tourist, I had met other people's American relatives, I knew something of American literature, and I was not unacquainted with the worst as well as the best that America can do in fiction. I had my preconception of the American; I considered that perhaps I was equipped to understand him, though quite unfit to cope with him. All Englishmen think that there is only one type of him; and it is perfectly true that there is something in the English omnibus, in the English picture-gallery, in Stratford in the season and London out of the season, which call forth certain easily recognizable qualities from the transatlantic tourist—hilarity, self-confidence, a possessive air, the Americanism of the American in England, comparable to the proverbial Britishism of the Briton in Paris.

But that is only a single effect—the effect produced upon the New World when it is out on a voyage of discovery, returning upon the track of Columbus—treating us Britishers as our joint ancestors treated the red Indian. I soon found, as I said, that I was out in my calculations. Even my first distant glimpse of New York City was different from what I had expected. I knew that there were sky-scrapers, but I had never been told that the sky-scrapers were like this. When somebody said, "Here is New York,'' I saw what appeared to be a dim mist in the sky resolving itself into a sort of mirage floating over the river and the land; and that again resolved itself into an incredible prodigy of brick and iron and stone, a huddle of towered buildings standing together like a monstrous, impossible

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

citadel, a creature to dream of as we dream of tidal waves and cataclysms. But it was real, almost insolently real, putting its mountainous, unassailable side foremost toward the river mouth and the sea, its Singer Tower, its Ten-Cent-Storeman's Tower, and all its other nameable giants rising, as it appeared, straight from the river, advertising at the first glance the sheer monstrosity of America, of the American metropolis, of American wealth. The romantic distant haze, suggestive and wonderful, had become this hard, concrete, powerful thing, astonishing, impressive, audacious.

At first I was assailed by the feeling: "This is advertisement; this is the New York way of saying, 'You have done everything else in the architectural line in Europe and Asia; you have invented Roman and Gothic styles; you have used every combination of square and round and pointed; you have created more beautiful things than the world needs, but you never, never thought or dreamed of anything like this; this is our unique America; we invented it; it will be the first thing you see as you sail upon us from the Atlantic.'"

That was how it first impressed me. And for the moment it was no use reasoning with myself and saying that they had to build upward because they lived on a long, narrow island and had no way of expanding excepting toward the sky. There it was, impressive, prodigious, marvelous, everything that can stir the sense of wonder without creating the impression of beauty. And I was for the moment rash enough and unreasoning enough to stigmatize it as successful advertisement, advertisement so successful as to seize even the imagination; and I did not give sufficient weight to the undesignedness of the whole mass, the unconscious symbolism of this heterogeneous collection of business buildings, presenting, by the chance of collocation, the appearance of a whole.

For all cities worthy of the name, cities that are more than mere agglomerations of people, have contrived somehow, by accident or design, to put forward some monument symbolic of their character and culture, of that which wins respect and veneration there. Athens achieved this end designedly in the Acropolis, where her citadel of defense contained also the symbols of her religion and art. In the older cities of England the most conspicuous objects were the castles and the churches. The Tower of London, St.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Paul's, and Westminster Abbey dominated the first view of medieval London from the river, and modern London thrust forward its Houses of Parliament and its official buildings, symbols of its politics and its bureaucracy. Paris has thrust forward the Louvre to vie with Notre Dame in its dominance of the Seine. And it is by the same unconscious impulse, I suppose, that New York, having none of the religiosity of Philadelphia or Boston, having no respect for politics, like London, and no excessive respect for art, like Paris, has made prominent, not its cathedral or its political buildings or its art-galleries, but its business houses and its colossal advertisements.

But just as I am on the verge of pronouncing that the citizens of New York are absorbed in business a dulcet message from the West, beautifully typed on beautiful paper, comes to me, knocking the wind out of my sails. "I suppose you are back on your native heath and hard at work composing delightfully critical comments on our country." After that I shrink from verdicts, and especially from so banal a pronouncement as that the men of New York are absorbed in business. I do not know whether they are or not. But I do observe that the *idea* of business —business as a phantasmal and recurrent item in conversation—is dangled before the eyes and ears of the unwary visitor. But, thanks to my American correspondent and his timely distrust of my impressions, I am led to look back at the bias which directs our English view of the American "business" atmosphere; to remember that England, which is as much a nation of shopkeepers as ever it was, has never ceased to be slightly ashamed of the fact. It is part of our English tradition to maintain a large leisured class which, though deprived of the honorable duties of government and patronage and now largely plebeian in its origin, has not ceased to be decorative and is still the zenith of social ambition. This social ambition penetrates English life. None but the class of manual laborers has escaped it. Each class emulates the class socially above it. Each circle seeks to protect its social prestige by a jealous exclusiveness, and each aspires to an ideal of dignified leisure. The new democratic spirit is only beginning to break down these ring fences so austerely preserved amid the débris of the Victorian era. No wonder English visitors are impressed by the "business" pride of New York, coming, as they do,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from a country where a man's ambition is to do nothing to a country where a man's ambition is to have too much to do.

Here we strike a real difference, a difference in illusions. I do not suppose that the average American gets through more work than the average Englishman, though most of my American critics will tell me that he does. The difference is that an American seems to respect primarily the business by which he makes his money, whereas the Englishman seems to respect the hobby by which he loses it. Both of them, of course, are alike in wanting to have as much money as they can possibly get; but while the American respects the process of getting it, the Englishman has been taught to be ashamed of it. The tiresome vainglory of the one contrasts with the conventional hypocrisy of the other. The American should make allowances for the Englishman who may be betrayed into irritation at this interest in business before the latter has learned that it amounts almost to an artistic instinct. For you cannot be long in New York without observing that business has been actually embellished with that loving care which is akin to the care of the artist. I have been taken through offices organized to a point of efficiency which must be highly unremunerative. One is assured that millions of dollars are spent upon labor-saving appliances, which clearly satisfy the business instincts of directors on their artistic side—by which I imply their disinterested love of efficiency for its own sake. I venture to utter a conviction—*pace* my above-mentioned correspondent—when I say that this love of the machine is bred in the bone of the average American. College life, so far from destroying it, as it generally does in England, fosters it in America. A group of young men from Harvard and Yale, who for two days were my fellow-voyagers on a small ship, revealed, each and all of them, an almost passionate interest in the details of machinery which in later life doubtless will reappear in the organization of their offices as a punctilious feeling for instruments of efficiency.

If I am right in supposing that for most Americans business is not merely a profession, but a source of interest almost artistic in the sense that it is a pursuit adopted as much for its own sake as for its rewards, then it becomes easy to understand their seeming indifference to general ideas, their apparently limited imagination, their air of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being unexposed to emotion. For a century and a half they have been developing their country's natural resources—which at first they were apt to regard as inexhaustible. Industry and commerce have become the obvious national affair; it was inevitable that they should begin by putting their genius into business and all that pertains to business. I have listened to the general talk in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, and more than once to groups of farmers in country places, and again and again I found that just as the conversation in England is apt to come round to national and local politics, so in America men come to speak of the great millionaires or the local business celebrities. A barber in Boston who was holding forth to a group of commercial travelers was explaining that a certain person was a very close friend of a certain other person. "But he would not let friendship interfere with business. And," he added, with an air of finality, "one can't." The sentiment was approved. It was obviously a point of honor to keep business sacred from the violations of personal feeling. A clever lady whose culture was as much European as American told me that, according to her experience, men found it hard to get away from business; that they clung to it even when they were past the age of work; that in consequence they had few resources in themselves and were at a loss as to how to spend their leisure. But she added that the younger generation was keen on golf, baseball, and other games, and that this athletic interest was sure to make a difference.

And here we have the admitted reason why politics in the States is so much a question of finance. For all excepting the classes engaged in manual labor, among whom there is growing up a broad and generous conception of the State, political rights seem to be little valued excepting in so far as they confer economic opportunity. Roosevelt is careful to appeal to individual ambition as well as public sentiment when he says "our demand is that big business give the people a square deal and that the people give a square deal to any man engaged in big business who honestly endeavors to do what is right and proper." Every one, of course, must do what is right and proper, but rectitude and propriety must not destroy the chance, which every one possesses, of becoming a Rockefeller; the "strenuous life" and the "square deal" presuppose that Rockefeller is the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public ideal; and good politics must keep in view a nation composed exclusively of Rockefellers. In spite of his appeal to public sentiment and the common good, I am told that the Socialists, at any rate, will not be pleased with Roosevelt so long as he retains the popular motto of the "square deal"—which means a fair distribution of the license to cut throats.

The admiration which Theodore Roosevelt draws from, perhaps, the large majority of the people seems to lend color to the prevalent English idea of the gullibility of the American. That is an English mistake. I admit that I cannot myself understand why Mr. Roosevelt should be described as "magnetic." I have from my own observation seen that he is untiring; that he has an unending fund of vivacity; that by his extraordinary physical vitality he is able to maintain from morning to night an exuberance of spirits, a capacity for continued enthusiasm in rhetoric and invective, a rollicking air of school-boyish fun and vehemence; that he can provide a roaring theatrical entertainment which would delight any proletarian crowd in the world. But this is not what we generally mean by "magnetism," for his art of impressing lacks the subtlety and depth which we should associate with the word; it seems to spring from no hidden force of intellectual and moral power; he is not, in fact, "impressive," as was his far more subtle prototype, Abraham Lincoln. But I have talked with many Americans who, though not in the least carried away by his "magnetism," are none the less ready to lend him their support; who admit his crudity, but think it useful that crude facts should be crudely stated; who are aware of his vanity and egotism, but believe that those very qualities insure his honesty; who welcome his restlessness, his unconventionality, his headstrong impulsiveness, because these are the very qualities which are generally lacking in political, legal, and official circles, where only by something the opposite of red-tape is it possible to get things done.

And many even of those who do not agree with him admire his generosity, his quick sympathy, his kindly, impressionable disposition, and the very swiftness of his unpremeditated acts. Here is a nature which, with all its appearance of strength, may be easily swayed; but it will be swayed by what is personal, human, and for the most part generous.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And if I may seem to be writing in too free a manner about the people of America, criticizing, as it were, the very hospitality which they extended to me, ungrateful, as it might appear, for the innumerable kindnesses which I received, I would beg my personal friends at least to remember that I have tried to detach myself, as I did when I conversed with them, from those individual relationships which are very real, which ought to be a modifying factor in any general judgment, but cannot be the main basis of one's impressions of a country. Moreover, in arriving hesitatingly at certain preliminary conclusions, I know how much I owe to the frankness of certain Americans who spoke to me in criticism of their country. To these I owe a debt of which I am sensible, and when this article is finished I trust they will not think I owe them an apology.

So far as "gullibility" is concerned, it is certainly the American who often scores off the Englishman. There are people in England who think that America exists for the sole purpose of fêting celebrated authors and providing them with royalties. (For the benefit of American readers I may say that these people are only found in London literary circles.) Some time ago I asked an English author well known in the States for what purpose he was about to visit America, and a lady novelist snubbed me with the remark, "Why, to be lionized, of course." Poor Mr. X! He was received with all that hospitality for which Americans are famous; they gave him dinners and lunches; his publisher took him about like a menagerie and collected genial "high-brow" audiences to be entertained by him—and instead of talking he sat horribly silent. It is recorded against him to this day that he would not talk!

English authors who propose to be fêted in America must learn to talk, and they may talk about anything in the world so long as they do it in a genial, vivacious, and preferably boisterous manner. But, above all, let them beware of affectation, or any trick of personality which may pass for affectation. Mr. W. B. Yeats, for example, would have done well to have committed the sin of silence rather than to have betrayed to the mercies of the American humorist those poetical gestures, that beautiful earnestness, that grand manner which make him an object of adoration only on his own side of the Atlantic.

This intolerance of affectation, which may often blind peo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ple to real merit, is surely in itself a particularly healthy thing. One cannot fail to be struck by those very genuine democratic qualities in Americans which make them ridicule any attempt to gain personal distinction by adventitious aids. Wealth is the only adventitious aid which must be excepted, for wealth, in this practical business community, is a badge of merit, the insignia of power; and to be ostentatious about money is to understand the first business principle of conspicuous advertisement. If you are rich enough to own a sky-scraper you can reside in a hovel and live as simply as Mr. Rockefeller; if you are not, then, I am told, you cannot afford to stay at any but the most expensive hotel. But this sort of display, this chimera of prosperity, belongs to that artistry of business which I have already mentioned. The appearance of wealth is, at any rate, the appearance of a good thing. The appearance of gentility, without the solid hall-mark of wealth, is for the American the most detestable of frauds; and no man who is not rich would dare to say that his ancestors came over in the *Mayflower*. Not that the American positively objects to what we should call "good breeding," but wherever breeding tends to pass into mannerism or "side" it arouses his hostility. They have never had a feudal system in the States, and they have therefore no effete survival of feudalism. There is no such thing among them as an hereditary right to be insolent. Patronage or a patronizing manner toward the "lower classes" is not tolerated, for there are no upper and lower classes; there are only rich and poor, and the poor man of to-day is the rich man of to-morrow; and a rich man is far too proud of his fortune-making talents to be ashamed of the fact that once he was poor. No American would be idiotic enough to say, as I have heard an English lady say, "What I complain of in the poor is their ingratitude." The characteristic American view was put to me by a rich lady who said, "One thing I must complain of in you English: the low wages you pay to agricultural laborers." There are plenty of English people who still think that it is the virtue of the poor to be content that they were ordained by God to be poor; but every American thinks that it is the virtue of the poor to grow rich.

For here, in these vast States of America, there was a country waiting to be occupied and exploited. The wealth was potentially there; it needed nothing but labor and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

energy to realize it; the economic conditions fostered a spirit of equality which would not recognize any difference but in energy, will-power, and strength. The poor man has never suffered from the social handicap which holds him back in the Old World. His labor was needed. There was little to distinguish him from those for whom he worked. In time he too might join the employing class and climb up on the shoulders of others. Immigrants arriving from Ireland, Italy, Poland, and all the underfed or overcrowded countries of the world may at first offer their bodies and their muscles to the sweater. But they too are soon caught by the spirit of America and are drawn into it. The vivifying air, the atmosphere of emulation, the infection of competitive energy stimulate them also and turn them into real Americans as tough, as callous, as capable as all the rest. By thousands and tens of thousands they pour in—these raw, inexperienced recruits—and America drills and hammers them till all the callowness, the softness, and the useless gentleness is knocked out of them, and their very jowls grow heavier, their eyes harder, their emotions less troublesome.

I have been through slums in Boston and Philadelphia, and I have spent hours in that noisome, hidden region of New York which surpasses in horror even the worst that London can show. But they are mostly inhabited by these poor foreigners who have come out here to make their fortunes; who seldom disfigure by their presence the streets in which they do not live or work. Outside these grim regions one is impressed by the apparent prosperity and brightness of the people. It seemed to me that the average working-man was, on the whole, better off than a man of the corresponding class in England. In New York, it is true, I found it a rare thing to see men's faces that did not wear hard-set expressions; their eyes seemed fixed on a near and narrow point. Those expressionless, cold-blooded faces were so abundant in the streets and even the clubs that I shall always think of New York as the chilliest place I ever stayed in—and this notwithstanding the boisterous, hospitable, "hail-fellow-well-met" air with which you are invariably greeted. There are many individuals to whom I personally have reason to be grateful; but if I may leave them out of account, it struck me that the exaggerated courtesy and polite punctilio which every Englishman must

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

notice had possibly the same cause as that to which, when I was in Macedonia, a consul attributed the polite manners of the inhabitants, "They have to be very polite to avoid the necessity of shooting one another." But in Boston, Philadelphia, and other smaller towns where, if I observed rightly, this hard expression and apparent absorption of attention were no longer prevalent, it seemed to me that the working classes were not only fairly prosperous, but far more cheerful, more intelligent, more interested in life than the corresponding classes in England. And in general, among all those people who are evidently free from business responsibility, who may be junior employees of one kind or another, one notices an alertness, an interest in life, a hopefulness which contrast with the anxious, jaded expression so commonly seen in English cities. I do not know whether, when the increased cost of living is taken into account, these people are really better paid than in England. But they are better educated, they have more opportunities, there is room for hope, and they have the heart to create for themselves a standard of living.

It seemed to me that the women employees whom one sees in business offices, in tea-shops, or traveling in cars were of a higher average type than the men. The woman who "works" is respected in America; she commands a good wage; she apparently proves very efficient without having all the fineness of her sex driven out of her. She is decently educated, she is not desperately overworked, and she conforms to the American feminine fashion of improving her mind—a fashion which the man admires without imitating. In the wealthier classes, as in every country, this habit of improving the mind is apt to produce the *femme savante*. One man told me proudly that his wife was always studying, always gaining information on new subjects of information. He enumerated the languages she had mastered, the various physico-chemical sciences she had exhausted, the poets whom she had learned by heart, and the philosophies she was about to add to her repertoire. I have felt that some of these cultured American women who know everything are often not only the least likable, but also the least intelligent.

But the little game of culture which penetrates to the working classes has a sort of *naïveté* not without charm, though I can imagine it might be tiresome at close quarters.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I remember snatches of a conversation which I overheard between a young man and woman who sat next to me one evening on the boat which plies between Boston and Nantasket Beach. The girl was apparently a waitress at a tea-shop. The man was a workman who had been in the army. The former confesses that she keeps a diary. She keeps it regularly. Does he keep one? No, but he did when he was in the army. It is a pity, she thinks, that he does not keep it now, for they might have compared notes. He is not very responsive and obviously considers that this literary craze is commendable but inconvenient. I know no more of the affair. But evidently already this little pride of fineness which was offended, this petty subtlety which was neglected, had interposed just the slightest barrier in the love-making. Perhaps the man was right to be impatient. Anyway, it was a small matter. But these small matters may account for a woman's dissatisfaction even for a sense of superiority.

And putting aside altogether the question of class, that sense of superiority of woman over man is, I believe, a very common feeling in America. Women may be vain, but they are not often really conceited, and their evidence in a matter of this sort is worth considering. I will not attempt to record such scanty evidence as I was in a position to collect. I should distrust any conclusions I might be tempted to form on so difficult a subject. I may remark that an elderly New England gentleman, whom I revere, informed me that American women are freer in their social relations with men than any women in the world, but that their morals are beyond reproach. This praise did not astonish me, but I thought that perhaps "quite a little"—as my Detroit friend would have said "quite a little"—of the praise should be given to the men.

It may be that the women, being better read, and therefore in ideas more modern and cosmopolitan, are more self-conscious than the men; that they are more introspective, more various in their sentiment, therefore less easily satisfied by what is offered, being ready to give what in America it is denied that they should receive. However that may be, it is quite certain that, at any rate, the men possess a quality only to be found in young races or new countries—lack of self-consciousness. This is particularly noticeable in the young men of the colleges. The Oxford

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or Cambridge undergraduate is absorbed in himself and conscious of himself, and it is for this reason that the modern young Englishman between the ages of eighteen and twenty-two is often so unbearable. But the average boy at Harvard or Yale—and I have had special opportunities of noticing—does not appear to be in a half-baked state of transition between school-boy and man. He is still a boy whose strength and animal spirits have simply increased, who expresses his exuberant emotions without shame or restraint. He will laugh, sing, leap, or dance as the spirit moves him, and there will be no self-consciousness to dictate decorum or reserve. And when these youths have left college and have grown a little older there is still nothing to show that they have passed through stages of transition; they are the same save that they are a little older, a little less physically exuberant, a little shrewder, a little more business-like.

A nation of men free from the burden and the responsibility of self-consciousness, having the directness and the spontaneity of young school-boys — here surely there is something which we shall never regain in Europe till our civilization is broken up. However crude and unreflective these crowds of grown-up boys may be—and sometimes I seem to see them in crowds—it is wonderful to observe their exuberance, their ready enthusiasms, their energy, and even their restlessness. And if they have no personal self-consciousness, they have that consciousness of the *institution* which is so strong in school-boys, the institution of America. One marvels to find so many people, extraordinarily ignorant of Europe and European history, who have inherited the civilization and the ideas of Europe without being aware of it, and assuredly without being grateful for it, whose minds think in terms of America and the American nation. It is extraordinary that a country so vast and so varied should be so constantly in their thoughts, should arouse so ardent a sense of nationality and ceaselessly inspire them to demonstrative patriotism. Little as they think of themselves as individuals, they are always thinking of America and the Americans. They are impressed with their own size, confident of their own achievements, assured of their future dominance of the world. As the Romans in the days of the still uncorrupted republic first disdained and then patronized the Greeks, so the Americans first disdained and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have now reached the stage of patronizing the English. They will visit us to see our country and our buildings, certainly not ourselves. To adorn their robust republic they will carry away a little of our decadent art and culture or lead about one of our picturesque poets. They ask to be criticized, being confident that they ought to be praised. They have no doubts about themselves; they have the courage of conviction; they see their vast, irresistible republic growing over the hemisphere, shaping and making the new civilization of the world.

This energetic patriotism, this unwavering belief in themselves as a nation, is one of the qualities which lend such interest to their development. They are well aware that they are in a state of rapid transition, that they are growing into something monstrous and powerful; and it is not the few who talk about their growth, but the men and women everywhere, rich and poor, Americans of long lineage, Americans but recently absorbed. I doubt if they have moved so far from the days of Whitman and the Civil War as they are supposed to have moved. Even in those days they displeased the prejudiced Dickens; even to-day they are surely capable of shouting with Whitman the song of the "tan-faced children." Their imagination is still occupied with the felling of primeval forests, the stemming of rivers, the upheaving of virgin soil; and the transition to the stock-market is not so very great. It is the next transition which will interest us more—the coming of age of this astonishing nation.

R. A. Scott-James.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THE PANAMA CANAL TOLLS

## A BRITISH VIEW

BY ARCHIBALD R. COLQUHOUN

It is impossible, writing on this side of the Atlantic, to estimate the force underlying the agitation in the United States in favor of a preferential treatment for American shipping using the Panama Canal, but it may be safely said that public opinion in Great Britain is not greatly exercised on the subject. The Chambers of Shipping and Commerce have made representations to the Foreign Office, questions have been asked in the House of Commons, the papers have given a fair measure of space to the comments of their Washington correspondents, and belated representations have been made by the British Government, but the British Isles are suffering from a surfeit of sensations, and the year 1915 must take care of itself so far as the man in the street is concerned. It is not too much to say, moreover, that the average Briton has some sympathy for the theory that, having sunk on the canal some seventy-five millions and possibly a great deal more (Colonel Goethals in 1908 put the possible cost at one hundred millions), the United States has a right to make something out of it.

Finally, the habit of friendship with our kindred is growing. Public sentiment would be strongly averse to any attempt to quarrel with the United States, and the actions of that country are viewed with an indulgence that would not be accorded to others. Mr. Asquith has been criticized for a declaration made some years ago in an announcement of naval policy—that the standard then adopted excluded the United States as a possible adversary—but it is, nevertheless, true that the average Briton does exclude the United States from the category of those with whom at some period he may be called on to measure strength. This attitude



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must be taken into account when the British point of view with regard to the Panama Canal is considered. Great Britain has not hitherto taken the Panama Canal tolls question as one which could cause a serious breach between her and the United States.

Having made this clear, the writer, whose study of the canal question in all its aspects ranges over the last twenty years, feels bound to express the view that so far as not only moral but international obligations are concerned, the United States are pledged to equal treatment for all vessels using the canal and that coastwise vessels cannot in equity be placed on a differential basis.

The first connection of the United States with the canal was in 1846, but at that period the idea was merely to obtain the neutralization of any interoceanic communication that might be constructed. President Polk's government concluded a treaty with New Granada (then including the present republics of Colombia and Panama), the object of which, according to the Presidential message, was " to secure to all nations the free and equal rights of passage over the 'Isthmus.'" The same treaty guaranteed the neutrality of the Isthmus, and the American Minister in London was instructed to try and secure a similar guarantee from Great Britain. This invitation to Great Britain to join with the United States in securing the neutrality of Central-American territory is of importance in view of subsequent controversy. As a matter of fact, Great Britain had already taken steps to establish a special position in the suggested canal region. In 1841 her representative at Belize occupied Greytown as part of the Mosquito territory, the Mosquito Indians having placed themselves under British protection. Despite protests, Great Britain laid formal claim to the Mosquito coast in 1847, and by 1848 had entirely dispossessed Nicaragua. These circumstances and the comparatively weak condition of the United States Government at the time made the conclusion of the Clayton-Bulwer Convention, in 1850, by no means disadvantageous to the United States, although it was the subject of considerable controversy. The special object of the treaty was again to secure that equality of all nations which had been insisted on in 1846, but its chief provision, in the eyes of the United States Government, was that by it Great Britain bound herself equally with the United States not to " obtain or maintain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for itself any exclusive control over the said ship canal." The Convention dealt with Nicaragua, but (under Article VIII.) it is expressly stated that the object was " to establish a general principle as well as to accomplish a particular object," and it was agreed to extend a joint protection to any other practicable communications across the Isthmus, Panama and Tehuantepec being especially mentioned.

With the consolidation of the power of the United States after the Civil War and the expansionist policy that followed, the idea of a canal built and controlled by the Union gained rapidly, but the Central-American republics were jealous of their sovereignty and more than one attempt to deal with them proved abortive. A concession had actually been granted in 1869 by Colombia to the United States, but the time was not favorable and the concession lapsed, and in 1878 the Central-American republic sold the right of construction to M. Wyse, acting for a French company. The Wyse concession was the basis of future negotiations and is therefore important. By Article XIV. the right to levy certain dues, such as lighthouse, anchorage, and transit dues, was granted, but subject to certain conditions, of which the first emphatically stated that these tolls were to apply " without exception or favor to *all* vessels " (not " vessels of all nations "). The Spanish text is explicit. Part of Article V. of the original concession runs as follows:

"In general, all vessels are at liberty to pass without any distinction, exclusion, or preference of nationalities or persons on paying the dues and observing the regulations established by the concessionaire company for the use of the said canal and its appurtenances."

In 1890 the concession was extended to the New French company, and by Article IX. the rights and obligations of the original concession were to be retained.

Watching the flounderings of the French company, the United States felt that, after all, fate must play into its hands, but the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was the principal obstacle. From 1880 onward for some years the subject was hotly debated, Mr. Secretary Blaine endeavoring to explain away the treaty and Lord Granville replying without any tangible result. The question was left in abeyance for a time, but two circumstances brought it again to the fore. The first was the utter failure of the French company to grapple with the difficulties of construction, so that it became evident that the canal could not be built as a com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mercial enterprise by private capital. The second was the Spanish-American War and its consequences. The second Presidential message of McKinley dwelt upon the necessity for interoceanic communication, and thereupon began the negotiations which culminated in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty in 1901. The Washington Government expressly disclaimed any desire to disregard the Clayton-Bulwer Convention, but asked for such modification of it as would enable them without affecting the "general principle" to carry through the work.

By this treaty Great Britain waived the right of joint control, omitted any reference to fortification, but stated (Article III., Section 2) that "the canal shall never be blockaded nor shall any right of war be exercised nor any act of hostility be committed within it." In the subsequent treaty with the Republic of Panama, however, after stating that the canal shall be opened in accordance with all the stipulations of the treaty of 1901 with Great Britain, the United States (under Article XXIII.) claimed the right to establish fortifications, so that the policy ultimately adopted by the United States in this respect, while not absolutely sanctioned by treaty obligations to Great Britain, was certainly foreshadowed in an instrument not challenged at the time. It is quite otherwise, however, when we come to the provisions governing the use of the canal. The clauses dealing with this must be quoted in entirety:

"The United States adopts, as the basis of the neutralization of such ship-canal, the following Rules, substantially as embodied in the Convention of Constantinople, signed the 25th October, 1888, for the free navigation of the Suez Canal.

"The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these Rules, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable."*

The quibble which, I understand, is now raised—that "vessels . . . of all nations" means "all foreign nations"—cannot be admitted in view of two circumstances: first, the terms of the original concession (as to the modification of which there has never hitherto been any question), and, second, the fact that in abrogating the Clayton-Bulwer

* This clause (with the addition "and the entrances of the canal") is incorporated in the treaty with the Republic of Panama.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treaty Great Britain undoubtedly waived her treaty rights for a consideration. Few of those who followed the negotiations which led up to the sole control of the canal by the United States can have any doubt that that consideration was the belief that Great Britain would secure for her vessels facilities equal to those enjoyed by any others.

In June, 1902, the United States bought the rights, properties, and franchises of the New French Company, but it was still felt that to carry on the work of construction in foreign territory would be a severe handicap, and negotiations began for securing a zone of land. This obviously imports a new element into the whole situation, but mark what followed. The hesitation of Colombia in parting with her sovereign rights over part of her territory was overcome by the secession of Panama and the treaty of 1903 with the new Republic which secured the desired concession. But in the declaratory provision attached to this treaty it is expressly stated that the canal shall be neutral in perpetuity upon the terms of, and in conformity with, the stipulations entered into by the United States and Great Britain in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. Reference to a previous paragraph will show that the basis of neutralization is declared to be "terms of entire equality for vessels of all nations." The chain of evidence is complete. The supporters of a discriminative tariff would do better not to rest any part of their claim on a revised interpretation of treaties.

I have dwelt on the historical aspects of the subject because, although the question of treaty rights and obligations may appear academic to the man in the street, governments and nations cannot afford to disregard them. It may become necessary, if the United States should decide to question the meaning of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, to ask for the arbitration of The Hague tribunal on this debated point of the interpretation of an international instrument. If the issue were narrowed in this way there would be little doubt, on historical grounds, of the result. The contention, apparently supported by President Taft, that American coastwise traffic is not covered by international obligations, raises a fresh series of questions. Few people can even pretend to think that such an exemption was intended by one of the high contracting parties in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and even were that the case a fresh subject for discussion arises in the interpretation of the word "coastwise."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There are signs that, as the date for the completion of the canal draws near, the natural enthusiasm created by the completion of a task which has baffled man's ingenuity for over four hundred years is coloring rather too richly the forecasts as to the effect of the canal. Trade routes are obstinate things, and a number of circumstances—winds, currents, and climatic conditions—have combined to fix them and to keep them fixed unless some overpowering advantage intervenes. The object of interoceanic canals is the shortening of transit, but in these days of high speed an artificial waterway operated with locks has to meet heavy competition on many trade routes. Before the opening of the Suez Canal many people predicted the complete ruin of British ports through the transference of the center of commercial gravity, but no such untoward result occurred. It is an open secret that the canal has not troubled itself to cater to the needs of shipping companies. By the London agreement of 1883 the profits in excess of those previously divided were to be applied in equal moieties to the reduction of dues and the increase of dividend until the latter reached twenty-five per cent.; thereafter the whole of the net profits were to be devoted to reduction of dues until these fell to five francs per ton. These provisions have not been observed, the dividend for 1911 being twenty-nine per cent., and a very trifling reduction in dues being announced (from January 1, 1912) which left them still at the heavy figure of 6.75 francs per ton. Moreover, the Suez Company is at present so indifferent to the interests of its customers that it is notorious that a trifling accident may block the whole trade of two continents. The British Government, large shareholders in the canal, stipulate that their store requirements should travel by it, and British shipping interests are also represented on the board of directors. The net result, however, is not, as might be expected, an improvement in the service, but rather a form of protection for the canal under its present conditions. Incidentally it may be remarked that all analogies between the position of Great Britain and the United States in reference to the Suez and Panama canals are misleading, because the former is in no sense an appanage of the British Government, but is a commercial undertaking in which Great Britain happens to own a large number of shares. The general management is carried on at Paris by an Administrative Council of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thirty-two members, of whom ten are British and three of these nominated by the Government. The shares purchased in 1875 for about £4,000,000 have a present value of over £30,000,000. The points to be emphasized here are two. Firstly, that competition will certainly cause the Suez administration to "wake up," and therefore calculations based on present figures are practically valueless with reference to the future and to Panama tolls. Secondly, that canals are useful but not indispensable. At the meeting of a British shipping company last year it was stated that they found it more profitable to send ships out *viâ* South America and the Cape to India than through the canal, and that they had constructed large and powerful steamers for this trade.

In this connection, it must be remembered that the Panama Canal does not shorten the route from Europe to the greater part of Australia nor to any ice-free port in Asia or the islands off the Asiatic coast. New Zealand and Siberia are brought nearer by a small distance to Europe, but the Orient as a whole will be unaffected so far as the chief existing trade routes are concerned. New York, on the contrary, is brought some 3,700 miles nearer to Yokohama, 1,600 miles nearer to Shanghai, and 3,800 miles nearer to Sydney. The outstanding fact in the tables of distances worked out by various authorities is this: that the region which contains Japan, Korea, Central China, the Philippines, New Guinea, and most of Australia will be afforded by the opening of the canal an alternative route to great manufacturing centers. As regards the British Empire, the chief result—and it is one of great importance—will be the opening up of British Columbia and its hinterland to both sides of the Atlantic. For Vancouver and other British-Columbian ports there will be a reduction of 8,400 miles to New York, 7,000 miles to Montreal, and 6,000 miles to Liverpool. British Columbia, it is confidently expected, is about to enter upon a great era of development, and both in Canada and the mother country the prospects for the export of Canadian grain and other products to European markets by the canal are being anxiously considered. The development of the great Mississippi basin, and consequently of New Orleans, will be another factor, shortening the distance still more and helping to neutralize the disadvantages of the Pacific route from the point of view of ports of call. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possibilities in these respects are eclipsed, so far as the United States are concerned, by the certain effects of the canal on the Pacific ports of the South-American continent. The foreign trade of Latin America last year totaled over two billions of dollars, and the rapid rise to wealth of Brazil, the Argentine, Chile, and other South-American states is founded on secure natural resources. Last year the twelve Pacific coast Latin-American countries had a foreign trade of £100,000,000. The distribution of trade is interesting. Great Britain leads not only on the total, but in every part of the continent; but whereas in the northern half the United States is second, in the southern half Germany comes after Great Britain and the United States is third. In the order of activity Mr. John Barrett, of the Pan-American Union, places Germany first, Japan second, Great Britain third, and the United States fourth. The reduction of distance between New York and the Pacific ports of South America (an average of 5,000 miles) is somewhat greater than the reduction between that coast and Liverpool, Hamburg, or Antwerp, for which the average shortening may be taken as about 2,600 miles. It is obvious that the competition for the trade of Latin America will be greatly stimulated, and it is to be hoped that the result will be not only an increase in the volume of trade, but the reduction of the cost of living in those countries where it is at present excessive.

It is undoubtedly with this trade around the coasts of the two continents that the advocates of a discriminative tariff for the canal are chiefly concerned. They have grounds for urging their Government to some exertion in order to stimulate American shipping and coastal commerce. The days when the American clipper was a feature in international shipping are long past, and American trade is increasingly carried in foreign bottoms. A writer in The North American Review for January, 1911, pointed out the three great barriers to the extension of United States merchant shipping: first, the regulation which refuses registration in the United States of a vessel built abroad even if American owned; second, the manning rules, which require seven more men on each ship than are necessary under British laws; and third, the operation of the railroad trusts, which, in his opinion, would throttle the coastal trade and preclude small ship-owners from competing. He suggests

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as remedies the construction of a mercantile marine by Government, the repeal of the regulations quoted, and the subsidizing of vessels in some form, such as canal dues. The provisions introduced into the Canal Bill which forbid the use of the route to vessels owned by railroad companies is a measure calculated, of course, to meet his final difficulty, but perhaps it will be most useful to take his concrete proposals rather than more vague ones and examine them from a British point of view.

The laying down of a mercantile marine in the United States does not seem a practical proposal under present conditions, although the Government is rich enough to pay a fancy price for things if it wants them. Germany and Japan have both had to meet a sudden and imperative demand for merchant fleets. The former, it is true, can now build all the ships she wants, but she bought them, or such parts as she herself was not ready to supply, until such time as her own ship-building yards were able to cope with the situation. She has bought up whole fleets of British boats and superseded Great Britain on more than one trade route. Japan's methods are precisely similar. There does not appear to be any intrinsic difficulty in the situation. The question is whether it is worth while, and the answer to that may be found briefly in a previous paragraph where was recorded the position now held by Germany with regard to trade in South America. The enormous advantage which Great Britain possesses in her insular position, the natural and cultivated aptitude of her people for the sea, and her chain of coaling-stations round the world cannot easily be discounted. But Germany began with none of these advantages. Her policy has been one of discriminating subsidies, and as she had to compete with Great Britain, which, under the spell of Free Trade views even postal subsidies with suspicion, she had a comparatively easy task. To a Briton, therefore, it appears that if the United States wants to profit by the canal, which she has constructed at so much cost, she can best do so by developing her sea power—and a mercantile marine is part of sea power. "If the United States desires peace with security," wrote Admiral Mahan, in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for March, 1911, "it must have a navy second to none but that of Great Britain; to rival which is inexpedient because for many reasons unnecessary."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To build up this mercantile marine it will certainly be necessary to take a leaf out of the book of Germany and Japan rather than that of Great Britain, but whether it is necessary to take the step of discriminating in favor of American vessels in the canal is, at all events, open to controversy. The essential feature for the success of the canal is that it should compete on favorable terms with existing trade routes, and especially with the transcontinental railroads. Any discriminating regulation will increase the possibilities for competition and decrease the margin of profit; it will also increase the necessity for close calculation in estimating possible profits; and all these things will, particularly at the outset, militate against the free use of the canal. Moreover, the possibility of directing trade into particular channels is better met by direct subsidies than by a general immunity from tolls.

All these arguments, however, will probably appear disingenuous from one who may be expected to think more of the development of his own country, particularly of the Pacific coast of Canada, than of the interests of the United States. The implication need not be denied. Altruism is not the law of nations nor the inspiration of patriots.

Nevertheless, as a life-long advocate of the extension of communications in every quarter of the globe, I am not chiefly concerned with the smaller issues. The joining of the Atlantic and Pacific is a great work greatly done and will help forward the progress of civilization by bringing many peoples nearer to one another. The nations who are worthy to profit by it will do so and those whose future is truly on the ocean will follow their star and work out their destiny the more surely because of it. And because it is a great triumph for man over nature I should like to see its benefits as widely diffused and as freely granted as is possible, so that no artificial barrier shall interpose between it and the world which has waited so long for its completion.

ARCHIBALD R. COLQUHOUN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# MR. GARLAND'S BOOKS*

BY W. D. HOWELLS

THE life of any man of letters who has lived long with strong convictions becomes part of the literary history of his time, though the history may never acknowledge it. Or, if the reader will not allow so much as this, then we may agree that inevitably such an author's life becomes bound up with that of his literary contemporaries, especially his younger contemporaries. He must have been friends or foes with nearly all of them; in the wireless of print, whether he ever met them otherwise or not, he must have exchanged with them flashes of reciprocity or repulsion, electrical thrills, which remain memories after they have ceased to be actual experiences. Shall I own at once that in this abstract case some such relation was concrete in me and the author of these admirable books; that he is the younger contemporary and I the man of letters who has lived long with strong convictions?

I suppose we were friends in the beginning, and never foes, because he had strong convictions too, and they were flatteringly like mine. When we first met, twenty years ago or more, in a pleasant suburb of Boston, there was nothing but common ground between us, and our convictions played over it together as freely and affectionately as if they had been fancies. He was a realist to the point of idealism, and he was perhaps none the less, but much the more, realist because he had not yet had time to show his faith by his works. I mean his inventive works, for he was already writing radiant criticism in behalf of what he called veritism, a word he had borrowed, with due thanks, from a French critic whom he was reading with generous devotion and talking

* *Main-Travelled Roads; Other Main-Travelled Roads; Money Magic; Rose of Dutcher's Coolly; The Captain of the Gray-Horse Troop; Cavanagh—Forest Ranger; The Eagle's Heart; Hesper.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into any body who would hear him. There were as yet only a few years between him and the Wisconsin farm which grew him as genuinely as if he had been a product of its soil. He was as poor as he was young, but he was so rich in purposes of high economic and social import that he did not know he was poor. Some day, perhaps, he will himself tell the tale of that struggle to make both ends meet, the artistic and the economic ends, in those Boston days, and by teaching and lecturing to earn the time that he wished to spend in literature. He gladly wrote in the Boston newspapers for nothing, and in the best of them he was given the free hand which was far better for his future than a conditioned salary could have been. As to his present, he was such an ardent believer in Henry George's plan for abolishing poverty that with his heart and hopes fixed on a glorious morrow for all men he took no thought of his own narrow day.

He seems at that time to have gone about preaching Georgism equally with veritism in the same generous self-forgetfulness. A large public, much more intelligent than the public which reads novels instead of listening to lectures, already knew him, but I was never of this worthier public so far as hearing him speak was concerned, while we continued of the same thinking about fiction. When we both left Boston and came to New York, neither of us experienced that mental expansion, not to call it distension, which is supposed to await the provincial arriving in the metropolis; we still remained narrow-mindedly veritistic. This possibly was because we were both doubly provincial, being firstly Middle Westerners, and secondarily Bostonians; but for whatever reason it was he had already begun to show his faith by his works, in those severely conscientious studies of Wisconsin life, which I should not blame the reader for finding the best of his doing in fiction. But it is not necessary to make any such restriction in one's liking in order to vouch one's high sense of the art and the fact in *Main-Travelled Roads* and *Other Main-Travelled Roads*. The volumes are happily named: these highways are truly the paths that the sore feet of common men and women have trodden to and fro in the rude new country; they are thick with the dust and the snow of fierce summers and savage winters. I do not say but they lead now and then through beautiful springtimes and mellow autumns; they mostly seek the lonely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

farmers, but sometimes they tarry in sociable villages where youth and love have their dances. I do not think that I am wrong in taking "The Return of the Private" and "Up the Coolly" for types of the bare reality prevailing with the hot pity which comes from the painter's heart for the conditions he depicts.

At the time he was telling these grim stories of farm life in the West—that is, in the later years of his Boston sojourn—our author was much in contact with that great and sincere talent James A. Hearne, whom it was a dramatic education to know. So far as one influenced the other I do not think Mr. Garland owed more to Hearne than Hearne to him in practising in their art the veritism which they both preached. If I may confess a dreadful secret, I suspected them both at that time of being unconsciously romantic at heart, and only kept to reality because they did not know unreality. Hearne, in spite of such cunningest pieces of excelling nature as "Margaret Fleming" and "Drifting Apart," was often tempted to do the thing that was not—beautifuly not, as Mr. James might say—in his other plays, and was willing to please his public with it, for of course the thing that is not will mainly please any public. I have no doubt the author of these books did very greatly help to stay the dramatist in his allegiance to the thing that was, while on his part Hearne doubtless helped his younger friend to clarify his native dramatic perception. At any rate, some plays relating to the nearer and farther West which Mr. Garland wrote in the heyday of his Hearne friendship (it lasted to the end of the great player's life) may have been inspired by his association with a man who was to the heart of his true humanity essentially representative. As both were secretly romantic a little, so both were openly idyllic a good deal. Of course Mr. Garland's treatment of country life is more direct, more authentic, more instructive, and there is pretty sure always to be a thrill or a throe of indignant compassion in it which the milder poet did not impart to his hearers. Some plays which the novelist wrote at this time (notably "Under the Lion's Paw," a tragedy of Far Western farming) expressed this compassion, still more directly and explicitly than the stories of *Main-Travelled Roads,* and I believe it the loss of our theater that they have never got upon the stage.

But no doubt fortune that kept him to the story written

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be read was not so unintelligent as her enemies might like to imagine. In the invention of such a group of novels as *Rose of Dutcher's Coolly, The Eagle's Heart, Hesper, The Captain of the Gray-Horse Troop, Money Magic,* and *Cavanaugh* he has justified the constancy of purpose which the fickle goddess has shown in his case. She seems to have known what she was about in guiding his talent from West to Farther West, from the farms to the wilds, and liberating it to the freer and bolder adventure which he must always have loved.

If the work seems to lose at times in closeness of texture on its westering way, it gains in breadth. The workman does not change in it; he is always what he was: mindful of his own past, and tenderly loyal to the simplest life, as embracing not only the potentialities but the actualities of beauty, of sublimity.

Mr. Garland's books seem to me as indigenous, in the true sense, as any our country has produced. They are western American, it is true, but America is mostly western now. But that is a question apart from the question of the author's literature. I for my part find this wholesome and edifying: I like being in the company of a man who believes so cordially in man's perfectibility; who believes that wrongs can really be righted, and that even in our depraved conditions, which imply selfishness as the greatest personal good, teaches that generosity and honesty and duty are wiser and better things. I like stirring adventure without bloodshed, as I find it so often in these pages; I like love which is sweet and pure, chivalry which is in its senses, honor for women which recognizes that while all women ultimately are good and beautiful some women are better and beautifuler than others, and some are more foolish and potentially vile enough to keep the balance of the virtues even between the sexes.

This brings me to the question of something in the author's work which I suppose has given question of its advantage to other readers as well as myself. It is something which deals with character rather than incident, and has nothing of that bad allure of so much modern fiction in its dances of the seven veils. It puts the gross passions, the propensities to shame, rather than flatters or entices them; but it doesn't recognize the beast in the man's desire of the woman, the satyr leer which is the complement of the lover's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worship. In *Rose of Dutcher's Coolly,* in *Hesper,* in *Money Magic,* measurably in them all, you find the refusal, when it comes to the fact, to ignore what cannot be denied. I am old-fashioned, and I have moments when I could wish that the author had not been of such unsparing conscience. That is all, and with this wish noted I can give myself to the entire pleasure which the purity and wholesomeness of his fiction offers me.

There is an apparent want of continuity in his work. He has ventured from the open day at times into the mystical regions of old night, but the books here are an unbroken series in which the average West and Far West may behold itself as in a mirror. There is throughout, and in spite of everything, a manly and hopeful belief in the perfectibility of man and things. Indians, soldiers, woods, waters, he teaches me that they may all be considered to the national advantage. He does not allow me to despair of the hero, even of the heroine; he finds me new sorts of these in every sort of people and persuades me that they may still be naturally and charmingly in love with one another. He paints me a West in which the physiognomy of the East has put on new expression, kindlier, gentler, truer; he makes me imagine a life out there which has been somehow pacified and humbled and exalted as an escape from death and restored in gratitude to new usefulness in that new air on that new earth. He holds me with his story and he will not let me go till he has taught me something more than he has told me. Greater than this I do not think we ought to ask of any, and if we do I am sure we shall not get it.

At the end of my praise I feel that I should leave it largely unspoken if I did not specify the power with which certain characters and characteristics are enforced in this book and in that. With some hesitancy I choose *Money Magic* as possibly the most masterly of the author's books. More than any other since the stories of *The Main-Travelled Roads,* it expresses constancy to his old young ideal of veritism. He has not hesitated to take clay from the "rude breast of the unexhausted West," and he has molded it in shapes which breathe as with a life of their own like Bertha and Mart Haney (Marshall Haney); she the young, beautiful wife and he an old broken gambler, are heroine and hero on their own plane, where they may stand with the creations of great modern fiction. The make as well as the manner

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the uneducated girl, derived from New England and bred on the frontier, but not with all her slang and Far Western freedom underbred, is not more credibly portrayed than the rough Irishman who has outlived the saloon-keeper and desperado and has re-entered as it were into the primitive goodness of his generous nature. In both the power and the meaning of vast wealth is studied, what it can and what it cannot do, as I do not remember to have found it studied before. They seem the witnesses of its magic, rather than sorcerers who work it. The situation is most interesting, and the situation in Mr. Garland's book is what interests me more than the action; if I can know what people are, rather than what they do, I am the more content; and I have noted with the satisfaction which I should like to have others feel the clear conditioning of his people. In fact, his people mainly derive their importance from that. A given book of his does not present a problem for this or that character to solve; it describes a condition which shall test him. Sometimes it is an unfriendly condition, sometimes not; but the business is to show how he copes with it. In *Money Magic,* in *The Captain of the Gray-Horse Troop,* in *Cavanagh,* in *Hesper,* in *The Eagle's Heart,* it is always a sense of the conditions which remains with me. I remember the persons from them as I learned to recognize the persons from them in their full meaning. Perhaps this is so in the novels of others, but I do not think it is, and I consider Mr. Garland's novels for this reason particularly valuable as materials of social history, no less than as very entertaining personal history. One cannot read them (and if you begin on them you *must* read them) without becoming more and more convinced that it is our conditioning which determines our characters, even though it does not always determine our actions. The strong man, the good woman, grows stronger and better for the struggle with them, though I am not sure that this is what Mr. Garland is conscious of seeking to show. I dare say that he paints them, and cannot help painting them, because in his own career he has been passionately sensible of their stress even when he has not mastered all their meaning. As a singularly American artist, too, he instinctively devotes himself to the portrayal of conditions because America itself is all a novel condition.

W. D. Howells.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# PORTRAIT OF A LADY

BY GAMALIEL BRADFORD, JR.

LADY MARY WORTLEY MONTAGU (born Pierrepont) wrote poems, essays, and translations of some note in her own day, of none in ours. She also wrote letters which can never die, letters less charming, indeed, than Madame de Sévigné's because the writer was less charming, but full of light on the first half of the eighteenth century and also on Lady Mary herself. I do not refer so much to the celebrated letters from Constantinople, because those were probably arranged and edited for literary purposes, but to the general correspondence, which throbs and vibrates and sparkles like a live thing.

The writer knew quite well what she was doing. Speaking of Madame de Sévigné's productions, she says: "Mine will be full as entertaining forty years hence." And, perhaps with a touch of jealousy not wholly uncharacteristic, she depreciates her French predecessor, "who only gives us, in a lively manner and fashionable phrases, mean sentiments, vulgar prejudices, and endless repetitions. Sometimes the tittle-tattle of a fine lady, sometimes the tittle-tattle of an old nurse, always tittle-tattle."

Those who find the divine tittle-tattle of *Notre Dame des Rochers* not only among the liveliest, but among the most human and even the wisest things in literature, will not be the less ready to appreciate Lady Mary, who has her own tittle-tattle as well as her own wisdom and liveliness. How easy she is, how ready, and how graceful! Her letters, she says, are "written with rapidity and sent without reading over." This may be true and may not. At any rate, they have at their best the freshness of first thoughts, the careless brilliancy of a high-bred, keen-witted woman talking in her own parlor, indifferent to effect, yet naturally elegant in her speech as in her dress and motion.



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With what vivacity she touches everything and everybody about her, "a certain sprightly folly that (I thank God) I was born with" she calls it, but it is only folly in the sense of making dull things gay and sad things tolerable. See how she finds laughter in the imminence of sea peril: An ancient English lady "had bought a fine point head, which she was contriving to conceal from the custom-house officers. When the wind grew high and our little vessel cracked, she fell heartily to her prayers and thought wholly of her soul. When it seemed to abate, she returned to the worldly care of her head-dress and addressed herself to me: 'Dear madam, will you take care of this point? If it should be lost!—Ah, Lord, we shall all be lost!—Lord have mercy on my soul!—Pray, madam, take care of this head-dress.' This easy transition from her soul to her head-dress, and the alternate agonies that both gave her, made it hard to determine which she thought of greatest value."

In the constant imminence of life's world perils Lady Mary had still by her this resource of merriment, which some call flippancy, but which by any name is not without its comforts.

True, such a glib tongue or pen is a dangerous plaything and liable to abuse. Lady Mary's own daughter said that her mother was too apt to set down people of a meek and gentle character for fools. People of any character, perhaps, whenever the wayward fancy struck her. She darted her shafts right and left. They stung and they clung, for they were barbed, if not poisoned. Sometimes they made near friends as cold as strangers. Too often they turned indifferent strangers into enemies. Enemies, too many, Lady Mary had all her life, and they seized on her weak points and amplified or invented ugly things about her till those who admire her most find defense somewhat difficult.

Yet she did not gloat over evil. "'Tis always a mortification to me to observe there is no perfection in humanity." Her unkindness was far more on her tongue than in her heart. "This I know, that revenge has so few joys for me I shall never lose so much time as to undertake it." She had the keenest sense of human sorrow and suffering: "I think nothing so terrible as objects of misery, except one had the God-like attribute of being able to redress them." What she could do to redress them she did. By her efforts

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to introduce inoculation for smallpox she surely proved herself one of the greatest benefactors of humanity. In many smaller things also she was kindly and sympathetic. And what pleases me most is that she makes little mention of such deeds herself. One is left to divine them from curt, half-sarcastic remarks in other connections. Thus, during her long residence in Italy, it appears that she ministered to her neighbors both in body and in soul. "I do what good I am able in the village round me, which is a very large one; and have had so much success that I am thought a great physician and should be esteemed a saint if I went to mass." Later she had much ado to keep the people from erecting a statue to her. But she shrank from love in Italy which was sure to breed laughter in England.

Also, even in her bursts of ill nature, she had a certain reserve, a certain control, a certain sobriety. Indeed, she compliments herself in old age on her freedom from petulance. "To say truth, I think myself an uncommon kind of creature, being an old woman without superstition, peevishness, or censoriousness." This is, perhaps, more than we could say for her. But in youth and age both she loved moderation and shunned excess. When she was twenty-three she wrote, "I would throw off all partiality and passion and be calm in my opinion." She threw them off too much, she was too calm, she was cold. Walpole called her letters too womanish, but Lady Craven thought they must have been written by a man. Most readers will agree with Lady Craven. Even her vivacity lacks warmth. And it is here that she most falls short of the golden sunshine of Madame de Sévigné. Lady Mary is not quite the woman even in her malice. Through her wit, through her thought, through her comment on life, even through her human relations runs a strain of something that was masculine.

Nowhere is this more curious and amusing than in her love and marriage. She was beautiful and knew it, though the smallpox, by depriving her of eyelashes, had given a certain staring boldness to her eyes. When she was over thirty she "led up a ball" and "believed in her conscience she made one of the best figures there." When she was old, for all her philosophy, she did not look in a glass for eleven years. "The last reflection I saw there was so disagreeable I resolved to spare myself such mortifications in the future."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

She fed her youthful fancy with the vast fictions then in fashion, and the result was a romantic head and a cool heart. These appear alternately in her strange correspondence with her lover and future husband, Mr. Wortley Montagu. When they first met the gentleman admired her learning—at fourteen! And Latinity seems to have drawn them together quite as much as love. There was a sister, Miss Anne Wortley, and sisters are of great use on such occasions. Lady Mary wrote to her in language of extravagant regard and Miss Wortley wrote back—at her brother's dictation. Then it became obviously simpler for the lovers to write direct.

Obstacles arose. Mr. Wortley Montagu would make no settlement on his wife. Lady Mary's father would not hear of a marriage without one and hunted up another suitor, rich—and unacceptable. There was doubt, debate, delay—and then an elopement. Lady Mary eloping! What elements of comedy! And her letters make it so.

That she loved her lover as much as she could love is evident. "My protestations of friendship are not like other people's; I never speak but what I mean, and when I say I love 'tis forever." "I am willing to abandon all conversation but yours. If you please I will never see another man. In short, I will part with anything for you but you. I will not have you a month to lose you for the rest of my life." "I would die to be secure of your heart, though but for a moment."

Yet the apparent passion is tempered with doubt and reversal. She cannot make him happy, nor he her. "I can esteem, I can be a friend, but I don't know whether I can love." "You would soon be tired with seeing every day the same thing." No, it is all folly. Cancel it, break it up, throw it over. Begin again a new life, a new world. She will write to him no more. "I resolve against all correspondence of the kind. My resolutions are seldom made and never broken."

This one is broken in a few days. Again she loves, again she hopes. Everything shall be right so far as it lies with her. "If my opinion could sway, nothing should displease you. Nobody ever was so disinterested as I am." And yet once more cold analysis twitches her sleeve, murmurs in her ear: "You are the first I ever had a correspondence with, and I thank God I have done with it for all my life.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When I have no more to say to you, you will like me no longer."

Then she blows the doubts away, makes her stolen marriage, gives all to love, and in the very doing of it lets fall one phrase that shows the doubter more than ever (italics mine): "I foresee all that will happen on this occasion. I shall incense my family in the highest degree. The generality of the world will blame my conduct, . . . yet *'tis possible* you may recompense everything to me." How two little words will show a heart!

And afterward? She fared pretty much as she expected. Love hardened into marriage with some, not unusual, hours of agony. "I cannot forbear telling you, I think you have used me very unkindly." When he fails to write to her she cries for two hours. Then all becomes domestic and decorous, and as it should be; and her matured opinion of marriage agrees very well with the previsions of her youth. "Where are people matched?—I suppose we shall all come right in Heaven; as in a country dance, the hands are strangely given and taken, while they are in motion, at last all meet their partners when the jig is done."

Perhaps because she showed no great conjugal affection, there was plenty of gossip about affections less legitimate. Pope lavished rhetorical devotion on her. She laughed at it and, I fear, at him. In consequence he lampooned her with the savage spite of an eighteenth-century poet. She said unkind things about Sir Robert Walpole, and Sir Robert's son said unkind things about her, mentioned some lovers by name, and implied many others. Lady Mary's careful editors have dealt with these slanders most painstakingly; and though in one case, that of an Italian adventurer, they have overlooked a passage in Sir Horace Mann's letters, oddly confirmatory of Walpole, I think they have cleared their heroine with entire success.

After all, Lady Mary's best defense against scandal is her own temperament and her own words. It is true, those who have lived a wild life are often the first to exclaim against it. But in this case the language bears every impress of being prompted by observation rather than experience. She says of the notorious Lady Vane: "I think there is no rational creature that would not prefer the life of the strictest Carmelite to the round of hurry and misfortune she has gone through."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lady Mary's long sojourn in Italy toward the close of her career did much to increase suspicion in regard to her relations with her husband. Her greatest admirers have not been able to explain clearly why she wished to exile herself in such a fashion. But the tone in which during the whole period she writes both to Mr. Wortley Montagu and of him is absolutely incompatible with any serious coldness between them. "My most fervent wishes are for your health and happiness." And again: "I have never heard from her [her daughter] since, nor from any other person in England, which gives me the greatest uneasiness; but the most sensible part of it is in regard of your health, which is truly and sincerely the dearest concern I have in this world."

Lady Mary had two children, and as a mother she is very much what she is as a wife, sensible, prudent, devoted, but neither clinging nor adoring. She had, indeed, a happy art of expressing maternal tenderness, as of expressing everything, by which I do not imply that her feelings were not sincere, but simply that they were not very vital or very overwhelming. When she sets out on her travels she is heartbroken over the perils and exposures for her son. "I have long learnt to hold myself at nothing; but when I think of the fatigue my poor infant must suffer, I have all a mother's fondness in my eyes and all her tender passions in my heart." But her language about this same son when grown to manhood is somewhat astounding. He was a most extraordinary black sheep, wasted money, contracted debts, gambled, liked evil occupations and worse company, varied a multiplicity of wives with a multiplicity of religions, was once in jail, and never respectable. All this Lady Mary deplores, but she is not heartbroken over it; on the contrary, she analyzes his character to his father with singular cold soberness. "It is very disagreeable to me to converse with one from whom I do not expect to hear a word of truth and who, I am sure, will repeat many things that never passed in our conversation." Or more generally, "I suppose you are now convinced I have never been mistaken in his character; which remains unchanged, and, what is yet worse, I think is unchangeable. I never saw such a complication of folly and falsity as in his letter to Mr. G——."

Her daughter, Lady Bute, she was fond of. "Your happiness," she writes to her, "was my first wish, and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pursuit of all my action divested of all self-interest." Nevertheless, she lived contentedly without seeing her for twenty years.

That Lady Mary was a good domestic manager hardly admits of doubt; but I find no evidence that she enjoyed feminine occupations, though she does somewhere remark that she considers certain types of learned ladies "much inferior to the plain sense of a cook maid who can make a good pudding and keep the kitchen in good order." Among her numerous benefactions in Italy was the teaching of her neighbors how to make both bread and butter.

It is said that her servants loved her, not unnaturally, if she carried out her own maxim: "The small proportion of authority that has fallen to my share (only over a few children and servants) has always been a burden, and I believe every one finds it so who acts from a maxim that whoever is under my power is under my protection." She was a born aristocrat, however, both socially and politically, and any leveling tendencies that she may have cherished in her ardor of youth vanished entirely with years and experience. "Was it possible for me to elevate anybody from the station in which they were born, I would not do it. Perhaps it is a rebellion against that Providence that has placed them; all we ought to do is to endeavor to make them easy in the rank assigned them." And elsewhere, in a much more elaborate passage, she expresses herself with a deliberate haughtiness of rank and privilege which has rarely been surpassed. In her youth, she says, silly prejudice taught her that she was to treat no one as an inferior. But she has learned better and come to see that such a notion made her "admit many familiar acquaintances, of which I have heartily repented every one, and the greatest examples I have known of honor and integrity have been among those of the highest birth and fortunes." The English tendency to mingle classes and level distinctions will, she believes, have some day fatal consequences. How curious, in so keen a wit, the failure to foresee that just this English social elasticity would avert the terrible disaster which was to befall the nice gradations of French order and system!

Lady Mary was not only practical in her household, but in all the other common concerns of life. Rarely has a woman pushed her husband on in the world with more vigor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ous energy than is shown in the letters she writes to Mr. Wortley Montagu, urging him to drop his diffidence and claim what he deserves. "No modest man ever did, or ever will, make his fortune."

As regards money also she was eminently a woman of business—too eminently, say her enemies. One reason alleged for her quarrel with Pope is his well-meant advice which brought her large losses in South Sea speculation. However much one may like and admire her, it is impossible wholly to explain away Walpole's picture of her sordid avarice, which cannot be omitted, though hideous. "Lady Mary Wortley is arrived; I have seen her; I think her avarice, her dirt, and her vivacity are all increased. Her dress, like her languages, is a *galimatias* of several countries; the groundwork rags, and the embroidery nastiness. She wears no cap, no handkerchief, no gown, no petticoat, no shoes. An old black-laced hood represents the first; the fur of a horseman's coat, which replaces the third, serves for the second; a dimity petticoat is deputy and officiates for the fourth; and slippers act the part of the last."

It is easy here to see the brush of hatred deepening the colors; but hatred can hardly have invented the whole. Yet all the references to money matters in Lady Mary's letters are sane and commendable. She hates poverty, and she hates extravagance as the road to poverty, and she cherishes thrift as the assurance of independence and comfort. That sort of lavish living which is certain to end in suffering for self and others she condemns bitterly. Will any one say she can condemn it too bitterly? "He lives upon rapine —I mean running in debt to poor people, who perhaps he will never be able to pay." But I do not find that she unduly prizes money for itself. We should seek riches, she says, but why? "As the world is and will be 'tis a sort of duty to be rich, that it may be in one's power to do good, riches being another word for power"; with which compare the remark of Gray, a man surely not liable to the charge of avarice: "It is a striking thing that one can't only not live as one pleases, but where and with whom one pleases, without money. Swift somewhere says that money is liberty; and I fear money is friendship, too, and society and almost every external blessing. It is a great, though ill-natured, comfort to see most of those who have it in plenty, without pleasure, without liberty, and without friends."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nevertheless, it must be admitted that in these questions of conduct Lady Mary does not err on the side of enthusiasm. In a long and curious passage she enlarges on the virtues of her favorite model—Atticus, the typical trimmer and opportunist, who lived in one of the greatest crises of the world and weathered it safe and rich, who had many friends and served many and betrayed none, but did not think any cause good enough to die for.

As regards social life and general human relations, it is very much the same. Lady Mary had vast acquaintance. I do not find that she had many friends either dear or intimate. Of Lady Oxford she does, indeed, always speak with deep affection. And she says of herself, no doubt truly: "I have a constancy in my nature that makes me always remember my old friends." Also her love of a snapping exchange of wit made her appreciate conversation. "You know I have ever been of opinion that a chosen conversation, composed of a few that one esteems, is the greatest happiness of life." Yet she was too full of resources to need people, too critical to love people, too little sympathetic to pity people. And in one of the lightning sentences of self-revelation she shows a temperament not perfectly endowed by Heaven for friendship: "I manage my [two] friends with such a strong yet with a gentle hand that they are both willing to do whatever I have a mind to."

But if she did not love mankind she found them endlessly amusing, a perpetual food for observation and curiosity. And the wandering life she led nourished this taste to the fullest degree. "It was a violent transition from your palace and company to be locked up all day with my chambermaid and sleep at night in a hovel; but my whole life has been in the Pindaric style." It is this love of diversity, this keen sense of the human in all its phases, which give zest to her Turkish letters and the record of wanderings and hardships which might not now be encountered in a journey to the pole. But long wanderings and strange faces are not necessary for the naturalist of souls, who can find the ugliest weeds and tenderest flowers at his own front door. Lady Mary was never tired of studying souls, and thought highly of her own discernment in them. "I have seldom been mistaken in my first judgment of those I thought it worth while to consider." This confidence I am sorry to find in her, for I have always held it a good rule

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that those who asserted their sure judgment of men knew little about them. True insight is more modest. At any rate, mistaken or not, she found the varied spectacle of human action endlessly diverting and again and again recurs to the charm of it: "I endeavor upon this occasion to do as I have hitherto done in all the odd turns of my life; turn them, if I can, to my diversion." "I own I enjoy vast delight in the folly of mankind; and, God be praised, that is an inexhaustible source of enjoyment."

But, though she could always amuse herself with men and women, she could also amuse herself without them and needed neither courtship nor cards nor gossip to keep her heart at ease. It is true that in youth she knew youth's restlessness and that haunting dread, chronic to some souls, which fills one day with anxiety as to what may fill the next. To Mrs. Hewet she writes: "Be so good as never to read a letter of mine but in one of those minutes when you are entirely alone, weary of everything, and *inquiète* to think of what you shall do next. All people who live in the country must have some of those minutes." But time soothes this and makes the present seem so inadequate that the poor shreds of life remaining can never quite eke it out. "I have now lived almost seven years in a stricter retirement than yours in the Isle of Bute, and can assure you I have never had half an hour heavy on my hands for want of something to do."

Her country life did not, indeed, include much ecstasy over the natural world. She was born too early for Rousseau, and it is doubtful whether high romance could ever have seriously appealed to her. She finds Venice a gay social center. Of its poetry, its mystery, its moonlight never a word. Perhaps these did not exist before Byron. On the Alps and their sublimity she has as delightful a phrase as the whole eighteenth century can furnish (italics mine): "The prodigious prospect of mountains covered with eternal snow, clouds hanging far below our feet, and the vast cascades tumbling down the rocks with a confused roaring, would have been *solemnly entertaining* to me if I had suffered less from the extreme cold that reigns here." If that is not Salvator Rosa in little, what is? I know few things better, unless it be Ovid's "*Nile jocose,*" gamesome Nile.

No. Lady Mary's nature, like that of most of her contemporaries, was an artful invention of trim lawns, boxed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

walks, shady alleys with a statue at the end, or a ruined temple on a turfy hill. Such gardens she liked well enough to stroll in, but the garden that charmed her most was the garden of her soul. "Whoever will cultivate their own mind will find full employment. Every virtue does not only require great care in the planting, but as much daily solicitude in cherishing as exotic fruits and flowers." "Add to this the search after knowledge (every branch of which is entertaining) and the longest life is too short for the pursuit of it."

In that pursuit she never tired from early youth to her last years. Indeed, among her contemporaries she had the reputation of a learning as masculine as some of her other tastes and habits. In this rumor probably exaggerated, as usual. She herself, in her many interesting references to her education, disclaims anything of the sort. She was a bright child, with a passion for reading. She learned Latin, French, and Italian, and used them, but rather as a reader than as a scholar. Systematic intellectual training she could hardly have had or desired, merely that passionate delight in the things of the mind which is the greatest blessing a human being can inherit. "If," she says of her granddaughter, "she has the same inclination (I should say passion) for learning that I was born with, history, geography, and philosophy will furnish her materials to pass away cheerfully a longer life than is allotted to mortals."

She had, however, little disposition to brag of her acquirements. On the contrary, it is singular with what insistence, bitterness almost, she urges that a woman should never, never allow herself to be thought wiser or more studious than her kind. Read if you please, think if you please, but keep it to yourself. Otherwise women will laugh at you and men avoid you. "I never studied anything in my life and have always (at least from fifteen) thought the reputation of learning a misfortune to a woman." And again of her granddaughter, with a sharp tang that hints at many sad experiences: "The second caution to be given her is to conceal whatever learning she attains with as much solicitude as she would hide crookedness or lameness; the parade of it can only serve to draw on her the envy, and consequently the most inveterate hatred, of all he and she fools, which will certainly be at least three parts in four of all her acquaintance."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is in this spirit that Lady Mary speaks very slightingly of her own poems and other writings. For us they are chiefly significant as emphasizing, in their coarseness and in some other peculiarities, that masculine strain which has been so apparent in many sides of her interesting personality.

As a critic she is more fruitful than as an author, and her remarks on contemporary writers have a singular vigor and independence. Johnson she recommends for the idle and ignorant. "Such gentle readers may be improved by a moral hint, which, though repeated over and over from generation to generation, they never heard in their lives." Fielding and Smollett she adores—again the man's taste, you see. On Clarissa she is charming. The man in her disapproves, derides. The woman weeps "like any milkmaid of sixteen over the ballad of the Lady's Fall." But weeping, laughing, or yawning, she reads, reads, reads. For she is a true lover of books. And she thus delightfully amplifies Montesquieu's delightful eulogy, *Je n'ai jamais eu de chagrin qu'une demi heure de lecture ne pouvait dissiper:* "I wish your daughters to resemble me in nothing but the love of reading, knowing by experience how far it is capable of softening the cruelest accidents of life; even the happiest cannot be passed over without many uneasy hours; and there is no remedy so easy as books, which, if they do not give cheerfulness, at least restore quiet to the most troubled mind. Those that fly to cards or company for relief generally find they only exchange one misfortune for another."

It is, then, already manifest that in the things of the spirit Lady Mary was as masculine and as stoical as in things of the flesh. In very early youth she translated Epictetus, and he stayed by her to the grave. Life has its vexations and many of them. People fret and torment till even her equanimity sometimes gives way. "I am sick with vexation." But in general she surmounts or forgets, now with an unpleasant, haughty fling of cynical scorn: "For my part, as it is my established opinion that this globe of ours is no better than a Holland cheese and the walkers about in it mites, I possess my mind in patience, let what will happen; and should feel tolerably easy, though a great rat came and ate half of it up"; now, as in her very last years, with a gentle reminiscence of her heroic teacher: "In this world much must be suffered, and we ought all to follow the rule of Epictetus, 'Bear and forbear.'"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As for nerves, vapors, melancholy, she has little experience of such feminine weakness and no patience with it. "Mutability of sublunary things is the only melancholy reflection I have to make on my own account." She seldom makes any other. "Strictly speaking, there is but one real evil—I mean, acute pain; all other complaints are so considerably diminished by time that it is plain the grief of it is owing to our passions, since the sensation of it vanishes when that is over." If by chance any little wrinkle shows itself, sigh from some unknown despair, winter shadow of old age and failing strength and falling friends, let us smooth it, strangle it, obliterate it by a book or a flower or a smile. In these matters habit is all.

And what was God in Lady Mary's life? Apparently little or nothing. As strangely little as in so many eighteenth-century lives. There is no rebellion, no passionate debate of hope and doubt; simply, as it seems, very little thought given to the subject. Religion is a useful thing—for the million, oh, an excellent thing, under any garb, in Turkey, in Italy, in England. Respect it? Yes. Cherish it? Yes. Believe it? The question is—well, an impertinent one. And if it be said that there may have been a feeling that some things were too sacred to be spoken about, let any one who can read Lady Mary's letters through and retain that idea cling to it for his comfort.

No, she lived like a gentlewoman; I had almost said like a gentleman, with a decent regard for the proprieties, a fundamental instinct of duty, a fair share of human charity, and an inexhaustible delight in the fleeting shows of time. And she died as she had lived. "Lady Mary Wortley, too, is departing," says Horace Walpole. "She brought over a cancer in her breast, which she concealed till about six weeks ago. It burst and there are no hopes of her. She behaves with great fortitude and says she has lived long enough."

Altogether, not a winning figure, but a solid one, who, with many oddities, treads earth firmly and makes life seem a little more respectable.

GAMALIEL BRADFORD, JR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# TWO VIEWS OF ART

## A DIALOGUE

BY ARTHUR C. BENSON

I WENT the other day to the Tate Gallery with a friend, John Fielding, who somewhat scornfully follows the profession of an art critic, scornfully because he agrees with William Morris in thinking it a shameful thing to sell one's opinions for money. But for all that and perhaps because of all that he has a fine and illuminating mind, so that I have the pleasure when I am with him of feeling his thought traverse my own somewhat as a search-light passes still and severe through the night-mist of a harborage.

He was mildly vexed at the sort of pictures I wanted to stop and look at. The Tate Gallery is a favorite haunt of mine; it contains some astonishingly beautiful pictures, some very curious ones, some interesting, some grotesque, some ludicrous, and some, I think, so bad as to have a delicious kind of horror about them which produces a shuddering sort of enjoyment, like the enjoyment one gets from the horned, slimy, bulging, stout things in a marine aquarium.

"I'm afraid you don't care about art," he said to me, with a good-natured rather kind smile, as he waited by me, averting his eyes from some difficult horror which I was luxuriating in. "Yes," I said, "I do care very much about art, at least I like pictures very much; more, I believe, than you do—my taste is more catholic."

"Ah, yes," he said, "it is just that. You don't care about artistic quality. You are on the lookout for quite different things—emotion, interest, color, absurdity, invention—all the things which a picture may have if they are subordinated to the central idea; it's the central idea which you miss—conception first, then execution; it's a question of design and structure and manipulation. Of course, I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

envy you as a gourmand may envy a child its appetite; you have appetite, you have not got discrimination. I have watched you carefully, and you pass by some of the best things."

"I don't dispute it," I said; "I quite realize that you have a quite separate set of values—but I don't quite know how you arrived at them."

"Oh, it's an instinct," he said, "rather carefully trained; but the instinct is what matters, and I don't honestly think you would ever arrive at it. I brought a boy of sixteen here the other day, the son of a friend of mine who has got the instinct to the ends of his fingers. He went straight for what I consider the best things; he made some mistakes, but they were creditable mistakes; he gave me the most splendid reasons. I asked him several times, 'Why do you like that?' 'Oh,' he said, 'the man has done exactly what he intended to do; you see at once where he means you to look, and the rest is like—well, it's like the leaves round a flower.' I took him to one of Millais's worst efforts and said, 'What do you think of that?' 'I hate it,' he said; 'it isn't real; it's made up; it's all *put* there.' When he came away he said to me: 'I wonder why English artists can't paint anything with figures in it? They can paint single people beautifully, and they can paint fields and woods, but when there are people in a picture they all seem to be saying to themselves, "Am I looking right?" They don't look at one another or care what is going on, only to seem to care.' That's a sound piece of criticism."

"Yes," I said, "I think there is something in it; but I still do not fully understand. I will not let you say that I do not care about pictures in the right way; I feel the emotion of them very much; these great old-English landscapes—I can't say how they move me; those remote woodland spaces, with the sandy road winding through the broken forest, the far-off plain with the shining river-loops full of golden haze, the piles of fresh cloud with the scattered sunlight, the somber moorland rising harshly and stiffly into the sky—they transport me in a moment to something which I cannot describe—old haunting memories, places seen in dreams and half forgotten, a mystery of tranquil thought. Is all that nothing?"

"No," he said, "it is a great deal; but, all the same, what you are looking out for is the romantic quality and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not the artistic. That is a much stiffer and harder thing. It is like that verse in Job, I think, where Elihu says, 'Let us choose to us judgment; let us know among ourselves what is good.' I do not say that I get so much fun out of it as you do; but if the critical sense is there one must use it; one can't escape; and I can't bear to look at some of the things you enjoy. I am only conscious of a mass of mistakes and misapplied trouble and false effects; the idea is not clear to start with, and the man has changed his mind a dozen times in the course of the painting."

"Yes," I said, "I don't think I go behind the picture. I sometimes see that it is coarse, vulgar, inane, stupid—then I don't look at it unless its inanity is amusing; but what I don't see is how you know what the idea is, and still less how you know what it ought to be."

"Oh," said he, "no amount of intellectual planning of a picture will make it worth anything. Some of the most carefully planned pictures are the worst of all; but one can see whether the idea darted into the man's mind, and still more whether it was all in his mind all the time he was painting it. That is the essential thing; it must not be done in bits; it must be all present, the end and the beginning alike; and to me some of the most interesting pictures of all are those where the vital thought is all there, and the man just fails in execution; that makes a much finer picture than a picture where all the parts separately are perfectly painted and the conception is vague. But I notice that it is just that kind of picture—the kind, I mean, where the conception just can't make itself felt—that interests you least."

"Yes," I said, "when we went together to the Post-impressionists I remember that I thought you had a curious solemnity about you, like a man looking on at a railway accident, while I was frankly amused with a delicious sort of stupefaction that anything so ludicrous could be deliberately brought together."

"Ah," said he, "I don't feel certain about the Post-impressionists; but I am not at all sure that they have not got hold of something very large indeed, though I admit the performance was not equal to the idea—it was like children playing with dynamite."

"Of course," I said, "I quite see that you have got hold of something I don't understand. I don't deny that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

you have a sort of sixth sense, and I am sure it is there; I don't understand your criticisms, but I can see that you are going by certain very definite rules or canons which hang together. Do you remember going to the National Gallery with Charles Corbett? He was in a kind of agony at some of your remarks, the agony of a sensible man in the presence of a frantic poseur. He said to me afterward that he cared very much about pictures and had been pretty carefully through all the best galleries in Europe, but he said of you that you were a very clever man but awfully wrong-headed. 'You may take my word for it,' he said, 'there really isn't anything in what Fielding says about some of these things. He doesn't seem to have any respect for authority, and he reads all sorts of qualities into quite worthless pictures.' I had not agreed with you, but neither did I agree with him."

"Poor Corbett!" said Fielding; "he is quite on the wrong tack. He is all deference, and never really sees anything."

"I will tell you," I said, "what I felt by an illustration. I took an Italian friend of mine to my club the other day. We fell in with three literary men in the smoking-room—Fellowes, the dramatic critic, Macnab, the Edinburgh professor, and O'Brien, the poet. They were discussing something with much animation, and the national brogues came out very strongly as they do when people get excited. I told my Italian afterward that they were to me very typical people—an Englishman, a Scotchman, an Irishman. I said I could have told their nationalities anywhere by their accents. 'You surprise me very much,' said my friend. 'To me they all seemed to speak exactly the same perfectly refined English. Indeed, if I had been asked, I should have said that Macnab was the most characteristically English of the three—he spoke so distinctly; and of the other two I should have said that Fellowes's English was just a little more slovenly than O'Brien's. To my ears there was not a trace of distinctive accent in any of them.' I was quite unable to explain to my Italian what the differences were and how half a dozen words from the lips of either Macnab or O'Brien would have sufficed to show their nationality."

"Yes," said Fielding, "that's a good comparison; the differences which I see in pictures are so absolutely plain to me that it is, or used to be, simply inconceivable that



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

others don't see them—and that is always the difficulty of talking about art—we simply, most of us, mean wholly different things; and I don't for a moment say that there are not plenty of things in art besides connoisseurship, only connoisseurs seldom differ except about details. They have different theories of beauty, of course, and the value of different styles; but the main point is as clear as stability to the engineer or proportion to the architect. It is a sort of mastery that I recognize, a control of resources, the right economy of material, a balance, a unity. Why, I believe," he added, with a laugh, "that you are capable of saying that parts of a picture are good, like the curate's egg. There are no such things as parts of a picture."

We strolled into the room where the Alfred Stevens studies and pictures were being exhibited. "Here's a good instance," said Fielding, "of genius. These things are very unequal—but it is all good. The man was a great man, and all the slightest and most hurried things he did are great. There's a principle for you. A great man is seldom much the worse for working under pressure or for money or by fits and starts. The finish may be careless, but the tiniest thing is great because he cannot help it. You can't be great by taking pains. Whatever you do is just an expression of yourself. The small man is always small. Of course, the great man may make an experiment on the wrong lines and come to grief, but the failure is tragic and not mean; and the small man may have a stroke of luck and do something exactly suited to his powers—but even so it is always a small affair."

I looked carefully at the exhibits; again I was mystified. There was one picture which roused me inexpressibly—the likeness of a dead boy, the heavy head sunk into the pillow, the shroud just revealing the pure curve of neck and breast, the curls lying lightly on the forehead, the lips still red with life; but the purity and sweetness of it all, the delicate molded chin and the eye half closed with that strange look, half of weariness, half of a kind of tender amusement which a dead face often wears—it affected me literally to tears, with the sense of loss and mystery and beauty all mingled in a yearning indescribable. But I could get no further with the portraits, lifelike enough, of solid, dreary men and women; while the studies, the scraps of molded work, the Dorchester House fireplace, with the bulging, muscular fig-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ures agonizingly supporting nothing in particular—it had no meaning for me.

I told Fielding my impressions. He laughed and said: "Yes, old man, you are not a connoisseur; here's a place which is all haunted for me by a grandeur I can't describe. This was a gigantic man, a spirit struggling with materials, straining and almost rending them in its efforts to escape and to speak. I don't say it is all perfect—far from it—but the power is tremendous, and he knew exactly what he meant and what he was at. That is an exquisite thing which moves you so—but that is the least characteristic and to me the least impressive thing in the room. You had better think of me as a sort of mathematician wrestling with formulæ. You are like a man full of health and feeling, stepping out in the morning in some delicious terraced garden, listening to the song of birds, elated by the sunlight, breathing in the fragrant air. But that is not what I am after. I am tugging about a theodolite and a chain, taking levels and measuring. Perhaps, unfortunately for me, the terrace has got to be straight and the angles square; but there is a pleasure in it, too, though it is a grimmer sort of pleasure than you own. You come here for recreation and pleasure; I come here to judge and decide. No doubt you think that you are right and that I am simply to be pitied. You are enjoying the scenery and the sea breeze, while I am looking at the dredged-up ooze through a microscope. Never mind me. Most people will agree with you, and I don't grudge you an atom of your pleasure—indeed, I see how real it is. But of course you are a sentimentalist, while I am a professional. But you may remember that you owe your pleasure to people like myself in the past; it is we who make the bridge and drain the marsh for the busy and merry folk to go over. A hundred years hence, perhaps, an irresponsible amateur like yourself will be looking about him with rather more discrimination than you possess. I don't deny the severity of my task. Sin, you remember, entered into the world through law; but sin is not the only thing which law develops; it's a mystery, but I think it all makes for peace. Meanwhile I get my fun out of it. You must not think me patronizing; I no more patronize you than Moses patronized the Israelites; but while you are gathering manna and dancing round the golden calf, I am up in a crack of the mountain with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ledges dripping with mist and something awful in the clouds overhead, making me signals which I cannot quite understand, but which I am trying to piece together."

"Go along with you," I said; "I feel like the people of whom Job said: 'After my words they spake not again. My speech dropped upon them.' I am gasping under the waterfall. But I am more generous than you, and I will do you the justice to say that, though I speak with the dignity of ignorance, I do believe that you have something in your mind which you would tell me if you could; but as a literary man let me offer you in return one caution: Beware, my dear Fielding, of metaphors!"

ARTHUR C. BENSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# WAS PANAMA "A CHAPTER OF NATIONAL DISHONOR"?

BY REAR-ADMIRAL A. T. MAHAN, U. S. N.

In November, 1903, following promptly upon the final rejection of the Hay-Herran Convention by the Senate of the Republic of Colombia, an uprising against the central government of the Republic took place in what was then the Department of Panama. The actual rejection of the treaty was notified to the United States Government by the Colombian Minister to the United States on August 22d, but the Colombian Senate remained in session until October 31st considering the general question of a Canal Treaty. On that date it adjourned; having taken no step toward a further treaty, but postponing all consideration of the subject to the next meeting of its Congress a year later, October 31, 1904.

On November 3d came the Panama revolt. The day before this occurrence, November 2d, the United States Government, which had abundant warning that an outbreak was imminent upon the rejection of the treaty, had telegraphed its naval officers on both sides of the Isthmus to maintain free and uninterrupted transit; to occupy the line of the railroad, if necessary; and to prevent the landing of any armed force, government or insurgent, at any point within fifty miles of Panama. On November 6th the Republic of Panama, having been declared independent by the insurgents, was recognized as an independent state by the Government of the United States. On November 13th the minister by it appointed was received officially by President Roosevelt; and on December 18th was signed a new Canal Treaty with the new state. This treaty followed the main lines of that which Colombia had rejected; but the Canal Zone was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

widened from six miles to ten, and the powers of the United States within it were enlarged.

The course of President Roosevelt in these transactions not only was marked by a rapidity and decisiveness which might be characterized as precipitate, but it secured results extremely advantageous to the United States. Naturally therefore the immediate impression produced was equally precipitate, and such as commonly follows where action unusual in kind and seemingly hasty coincides with self-interest. The act was looked upon as dictated only by considerations of profit, and as such was weighed in the balance of untested first impressions as to legality and obligation. The prepossessions thence arising have continued to prevent a clear and unprejudiced weighing of the arguments of legal and illegal; or of those of right and wrong, which do not always coincide with law. Yet an act profitable to oneself may be not only upright, but proper.

In such cases, however, there is an evident necessity that a due respect to the opinions of mankind should lead to a cogent exposition of the reasons for the action taken. Such an exposition was given by President Roosevelt in his annual message to Congress of December 7, 1903, and in a special message of January 4, 1904. A similar exposition was given by Mr. John Hay, then Secretary of State, in his correspondence with General Reyes, the envoy sent by Colombia to remonstrate against the whole course of the United States attendant upon the Panama revolt. It is to be observed that Mr. Hay, while undoubtedly approving the President's action, was in no official sense responsible for it. All executive responsibility centers in the President, and in him alone. The approval of Mr. Hay, therefore, carries with it the full weight of his known character for probity, moderation, and ability, undiminished by the element of self-defense inseparable from personal accountability.

This is the more important to be observed because the strenuousness of Mr. Roosevelt's character communicates itself to his speech and writings; the vigor of which, when exerted in necessary self-justification, tends rather to confirm the first impression of indefensibleness produced by the transaction, as summarized above. This undoubtedly has intensified an opposition which has assumed itself to be distinctively and exclusively moral; which has repudiated as im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possible any other standards than its own; and by confident asseveration has succeeded in determining a very general attitude of the public, as indicated in the press, at the mouth of which most men take most of their opinions irreflectively. It seems, therefore, not unfit to subject the matter anew to an analysis based mainly upon the official papers, which probably few have read and fewer studied. This is the more desirable because Mr. Roosevelt's action has been condemned recently and unqualifiedly by so respectable a citizen as Dr. Leander Chamberlain,* whose article I have occasion to think was considered unanswerable by an eminent lawyer.

Dr. Chamberlain's paper may be described as an impassioned arraignment of the United States, concentrated upon the person of Mr. Roosevelt. It must be remembered that while the nation and its President are separate entities, and while the action of the one may be censurable in the same instance that that of the other is correct, it nevertheless remains true that the responsibility of the Chief Executive devolves upon the people, if by them his act is approved, explicitly or implicitly. Upon this it follows that examination must extend not only to the immediate steps and reasons of the national government in the particular instance, but also to such other facts as may or should condition the entire subsequent attitude of the nation. Nothing has been done by the country to redress or atone for the alleged wrong to Colombia. Therefore—not Mr. Roosevelt alone, but—the nation is at the bar; and the matter for examination is not only the specific step taken and reasons given by the Executive of the day, but also the actual conditions of every kind at the moment of action. These should influence the decision of the nation now as to its responsibility for existing conditions, and as to any reparation assumed to be due.

It is not my intention to take toward Dr. Chamberlain's article the defensive attitude of replying *seriatim* to his successive contentions. I shall adopt the more direct method of stating positively the justifying points of the case for the United States. It is, however, essential to note and to subject to brief comment three propositions which Dr. Chamberlain calls fundamental.

"Certain fundamental considerations must be taken into account in

* North American Review, February, 1912.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any worthy discussion of the conduct of governments. First, that diplomacy now stands committed to 'the extending of the empire of law and the strengthening of an appreciation of public justice.' Second, that 'international jurisprudence is based on the moral law and embodies the consensus of civilized peoples with regard to their reciprocal rights and duties.' Third, that 'all nations stand on an equality of rights,—the old and the new, the large and the small, monarchies and republics.' It is, accordingly, in view of these considerations that the Panama imbroglio of 1903 is to be judged."

As regards these positions, any one conversant with the general subject will recognize that they bristle with controversial points and definitions. The third is a commonplace, though necessary to be affirmed. As a sovereign state Colombia is the peer of the strongest and richest. Equally, however, she is liable like the strongest to be dealt with according to her deserts. As to the other two,—that "diplomacy stands committed, etc.," and that "international jurisprudence is based on the moral law, etc."—the reply is that the basis of international legal decisions is not the ideal that this or that man or men may cherish, but the existing status of law in universal, or at least general, acceptance. The legal basis of judgment is what the law is, not what it ought to be. We long for universal peace, we aim at it and strive for it; but in the present distress we base our preparations upon the serious fact that war, as a means of maintaining international balances, has not been disavowed, and that there is no present prospect of such disavowal. In short, the legality and the morality of the action of the United States are two separate factors, to be separately considered. The legality depends upon the actual state of international law, not on any theory of its derivation or basis. The morality of the transaction is to be treated upon moral grounds. In treatment the two must not be confused by passing loosely from one to the other. If illegal, the fact may impugn the morality of a measure; but the question of legality is separate and should be kept so.

The present writer has no personal record here to defend, unless it be the imputation likely to be made of a perverted moral twist of intellect and of conscience in believing the course of Mr. Roosevelt vindicable in international law; and still more justifiable in natural equity, as applicable either to the community of states embraced under the domain of that law, or to those nations and populations which still lie without its pale. In general discussion, most deal-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ings with this subject have proceeded on the facile assumption that relations between states not only can hereafter become a matter of pure legal determination,—which being a matter of prophecy or speculation may be left to one side,—but that they actually now are so determinable. This is not the case. In the conflicting relations of independent states a particular action may be lawful—legal—yet not expedient; it may be both lawful and expedient; or it may not square with exact law, yet be essentially just because possessing the highest degree of expediency, that, namely, of doing essential justice between all the parties concerned.

In the case before us the Senate of Colombia had an indisputable legal right to reject the treaty. The question must therefore be treated whether the United States had a strict legal right to take the precise steps it did when the Panama revolt affected the *status quo*. It will be similarly necessary to examine and adduce in due course both the legal and moral aspects; recognizing that a transaction may be justifiable from the one or the other standpoint, while not necessarily so from both.

As far as has come under my observation, the entire incident is treated as between Colombia and the United States only. The interest of Panama is never mentioned. This is much as if the intervention of the United States in Cuba, in 1898, should be regarded as a matter between the United States and Spain alone; and from conversation I am inclined to believe that this is the lawyer's point of view, so far as justification of our action is concerned. Yet it is notorious that the suffering of Cuba was a very large factor, not only in determining our intervention, but in justifying it. Now there certainly was not in the Panama district any suffering precisely comparable to that in Cuba; but there was and for three years had continued to be the distraction, misery, and prostration, incident to civil war, concerning which the Colombian envoy to Washington, General Reyes, alleged "the weakness and ruin of my country after three years of civil war scarcely at an end."* Of this war the Isthmus was a principal scene; the motive being resistance to the central government. The territory of Panama, said General Reyes again, "forms the most important part of the national wealth."† Yet, having this im-

* *A Digest of International Law*, by John Bassett Moore. Vol. iii, p. 90. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1906. † *Ibid.*, p. 82.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

portance, it was really an outlying department, separated by long distance from the central government at Bogotá, and accessible only by sea, like Cuba. "It is known," wrote Reyes, "that there is no overland way to reach Panama with troops from the interior of Colombia."* This in truth was the sting of Mr. Roosevelt's order forbidding troops of either party to land within fifty miles of Panama. The measure was decisive. Was it also justifiable? This is perhaps the crucial point; for, given the rightfulness of the order, the rest follows up to the recognition of the new state, which must be defended or impeached on other grounds.

In the three preceding years the Isthmus had been constantly the scene of fighting. In 1900 there was continuous fighting about Panama, and British marines had to be landed to protect foreign interests. In 1901 severe fighting took place about Colon; both that city and Panama were seriously threatened by insurgent forces which in November captured Colon. It then became necessary to land American, British, and French naval forces at Colon, which finally was recaptured by the Colombian government.† All this imperiled the transit; for which the United States had made itself responsible and for the security of which it had become necessary at times to acquiesce in the intervention of European force, contrary to the known policy of the nation. These circumstances involved the United States directly in the troubles of Colombia; and if a new ownership of Panama would increase its security from disturbance, it would also affect favorably the treaty burden resting upon the United States. Therefore, the contingency of such occasion arising entered fairly into the contingent policy of the United States; the more so that the imminent probability of a revolt became known to it soon after the adverse action of the Colombian Senate upon the treaty was taken.

From this precedent knowledge it has been loosely inferred that the United States was in collusion with the authors of the revolt. It is well, therefore, to quote here Mr. Hay's explicit and categorical denial of such an insinuation made by General Reyes:

"Any charge that this government or any responsible member of it

* *A Digest of International Law*, by John Bassett Moore. Vol. iii, p. 83. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1906.

† *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Ed. 1910-11. Vol. vi, p. 712.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

held intercourse, whether official or unofficial, with agents of revolution in Colombia is utterly without justification. Equally so is the insinuation that any action of this government prior to the revolution in Panama was the result of complicity with the plans of the revolutionists. The Department sees fit to make these denials, and it makes them finally."*

Even without this evidence, the prior knowledge of the United States Government, and the measures taken to be ready at once to meet a probable emergency in which its own interests or those of its citizens might be affected, could not fairly be construed as action accessory to the foreseen revolution.† Mr. Hay's denial is conclusive. The United States was not a participant, direct or indirect; but if trouble arose it would be a directly interested party, not merely an intervener from outside. It was interested, not only as formal guarantor of a security which Colombia had repeatedly failed to sustain, but also by an avowed national policy familiarly summarized as the Monroe Doctrine.

Further, this national policy had introduced the whole family of European states as parties interested in the canal treaties, and in the situation constituted by the rejection of the Convention. Gradually, step by step, the United States had advanced from a position of joint guarantorship with Great Britain, of any canal at the Isthmus, to that of claiming and demanding sole guarantorship for itself; and from an avowed willingness to see the enterprise aided by foreign capital to an equally avowed determination that only the United States should undertake the construction. Such exclusion of other nations by force—for force it was—necessarily entails an obligation to them that that which we forbade their undertaking for the general benefit should by us be accomplished without avoidable delay. How admirably this obligation has been discharged since the authority to do so was obtained from the new Republic of Panama is now a matter of history; not yet wholly finished, but already with a record which will remain historical.

It is possible that the full development of this particular element of the situation, which was constituted by our obliga-

* *A Digest of International Law*, by John Bassett Moore. Vol. iii, p. 91.

† As far back as 1856 President Pierce took similar contingent action. "I have deemed the danger of the recurrence of scenes of lawless violence in this quarter so imminent as to make it my duty to station a part of our naval force in the harbors of Panama and Aspinwall." (*Moore's Digest*, vol. iii, p. 37.) It is a frequent anticipative measure.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion to the other Powers of the world, may not have passed through the mind of President Roosevelt, although in his messages there is clear recognition of an international obligation. But however partially or completely he may have worked out this specific conclusion, it is valid for the consideration of the nation in reviewing its own responsibility *now* for the action of its Chief Executive *then*. A right action may be doubly right for reasons which may not at the moment have occurred to the agent.

From what has been written, it appears to follow that the transactions, November 2–10, 1903, were no simple matter between Colombia and the United States, but complex. They involved our relations to other nations of the world and to the population of Panama as third parties. Panama was entitled to consideration as really as was Cuba in 1898. She was so entitled, partly because, although the United States was not under treaty obligation to repress domestic disturbance at the Isthmus, Panama was a principal sufferer from the conditions of disquietude which affected the transit; partly because Panama bore to Colombia much the same relation as Cuba to Spain, *viz.*: that of an outlying possession rather than of a contiguous and continuous territory. The impossibility of invasion except by sea substantiates this fact; and it is known that Bogotá is the capital because in the districts surrounding the city,—in the highlands of the interior,—is to be found the bulk of the white population, which at an early date withdrew thither from the hot and unhealthy climate of the coast. In that isolation they have preserved the language, manners, and physical characteristics of their Spanish ancestry, with all its defects and virtues, with less variation than any other Spanish-American state; and thence they governed the remote district of Panama. It is needless to remark how adverse to the interests of any community is administration by one so distant in time and in difficulty of access, as well as differing in racial characteristics. Whether or no such considerations were elaborated in the minds of President Roosevelt and his eminent Secretary of State, they remain factors for consideration by the people of the United States in estimating now the essential rectitude of a transaction for which they have become responsible by the approval of tacit sanction.

With this preliminary statement of facts and factors, I address myself now to the question of the technical legal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

correctness of the action of the United States Government —of President Roosevelt—in forbidding the landing of Colombian armed forces, whether of the government or of the insurrection, within fifty miles of Panama. This was undoubtedly decisive of the issue of the insurrection. It need not have been followed by recognition of the new state. It was open to the United States to say to Panama: "We have insured quiet by excluding national troops. Now we require you to admit them peaceably and to recognize the authority of Colombia." By the exclusion the United States held the whole matter in its hands, and stood between the parties as umpire. The intervention—of the fifty-mile order —and the recognition are separate facts; and though in near sequence are not linked.

In a complicated transaction, questions of expediency and of legality blend and affect one another practically; but logically they are different, and in discussing either it is necessary to exercise so much mental effort as to exclude for the moment the one not immediately under consideration. As a matter of legal interpretation, under international law, forcible intervention in another country or between two contestant states is a legal right, in the sense that the nation exercising it contravenes no dictum of international law. Abstention from intervention in strictly domestic conflicts is the recognized rule; but it is equally recognized that it is a rule which may have exceptions. The act may be morally right or wrong; it may be expedient or inexpedient; but it is not illegal. By accepted law, in this, as in declaring war, the state is its own judge of right. This is the present status of international law. It is evident, indeed, that if a state is its own judge as to declaring war, it must be so in any minor exercise of force, although it equally has no legal right to interfere except that of force; the independence of each state forbidding by accepted principle the intrusion of other authority than its own, except that of force. Such a step, however, may become illegal in special cases where the intervening state by treaty has given up its general right in the specific instance. Barring treaty, the United States had a perfect legal right to intervene by force for Panama against Colombia; still more to intervene, in such measure as she deemed necessary, to preserve quiet in a transit in which she was nationally interested. The question remains, Had she by treaty abandoned this right?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The allegation is that she had done so by the treaty of 1846, in the thirty-fifth article of which occur the words now to be quoted, which I believe contain all the stipulation bearing upon this question of legality.

"The United States, in order to secure to themselves the tranquil and constant enjoyment of these advantages [before stipulated] and as an especial compensation for the said advantages, and for the favors they have acquired by the fourth, fifth, and sixth articles of this treaty, guarantee, positively and efficaciously, to New Grenada, by the present stipulation, the perfect neutrality of the before-mentioned isthmus, *with the view that the free transit from the one to the other sea may not be interrupted or embarrassed* * in any future time while this treaty exists; and, in consequence, the United States also guarantee, *in the same manner*, the rights of sovereignty and property which New Grenada has and possesses over the said territory." †

It will be observed that these words contain two guarantees from the United States to Colombia (at that date called New Granada): 1, the perfect neutrality of the Isthmus; 2, the rights of sovereignty and property which Colombia possessed over it. It must be remembered again that we are dealing now with dry legal construction, not with the morality of any transaction whatever. Legal construction involves the interpretation of phraseology; and, where that is doubtful,—where the negotiators have failed clearly to express their meaning,—their purpose, when it is known or can reasonably be inferred, is a determining factor in reaching decision. Now, as Mr. Hay argued, the purpose of the United States in the treaty, in guaranteeing transit, and in guaranteeing possession, had reference solely to the need of the United States to use the Isthmus for transit in its broadest sense. The need had been brought closely home to our national consciousness in 1846 by the war with Mexico, in the course of which troops for the Pacific coast had to be sent by sailing-vessels around Cape Horn. General Sherman was one who made this trip, and was by it determined in favor of a canal.

For the above reasons the phraseology of the treaty where equivocal must be brought to the bar of this well-ascertained purpose of the United States, which entered the treaty with the express object of securing transit for herself, and, though incidentally only, for all other communities. Doubt as to the extent of the guarantee of neutrality

* These words are italicized as showing the particular object, motive, and reason of the treaty.

† *Moore's Digest*, vol. iii, p. 6.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

did arise long antecedent to 1903. Colombia in 1865 had raised the question whether it extended to domestic insurrection, and whether in such case she could demand assistance to maintain neutrality. The United States decided in the negative. Mr. Seward, then Secretary of State, wrote:

"The purpose of the stipulation was to guarantee the Isthmus *against seizure or invasion by a foreign Power only.* It could not have been contemplated that we were to become a party to any civil war in that country by defending the Isthmus against another party. As it may be presumed, however, that *our object* in entering into such stipulation *was to secure the freedom of transit across the Isthmus,* if that freedom should be endangered or obstructed, the employment of force on our part to prevent this would be a question of grave *expediency,* to be determined by *circumstances.**

This is a case of interpretation, which not only implies doubt but explicitly rejects a meaning which the words nevertheless might bear. The interest of the United States being one of transit only, not in Colombia as a nation, she was bound to intervene against domestic seizure only when the security of her transit was endangered, of which she was the judge; the question being one of expediency, not of obligation. This conclusion is based upon the evident purpose of the United States in the negotiations. It is to be noted also that such intervention is not by Mr. Seward's words conditioned by a request from Colombia. The right of originating intervention is preserved by them. So Mr. Gresham, Secretary of State to President Cleveland, telegraphed in 1895: "If for any reason Colombia fails to keep transit open and free, as that Government is bound by treaty of 1846 to do, United States are authorized by same treaty to afford protection."†

The question immediately arises whether the phraseology of the other guarantee, that of "rights of sovereignty and property," is open to the same construction as confined to foreign interposition. "Seizure" of territory is a violation of "rights of sovereignty and territory." It will be observed that in the clause of the thirty-fifth article, quoted above, the words "in the same manner" occur. The United States guarantees the rights of sovereignty and property in the same manner as it guarantees neutrality of the Isthmus.

* *Moore's Digest,* vol. iii, pp. 37, 38. My italics.
† *Ibid.,* p. 43.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The words therefore are not to be pressed beyond the interpretation that the object of this guarantee, like that of the other, is security of transit for the United States, which might be endangered or interrupted by conquest or attack of an external enemy, American or European.

Under these conditions the United States in 1903 saw impending again the danger of the renewal of the civil war which, only recently ended, had for three years distracted Colombia and affected transit. This had necessitated frequent interposition of the United States for the security of transit; and had occasioned just that kind of national anxiety and possibility of political entanglements that arise from intestine quarrels in ill-organized countries with which a close political connection exists; whether the connection be of geographical nearness — as recently in Mexico — or of treaty, or of commercial relations. The Eastern question and the Cretan question may be cited appositely as illustrating the same kind of problem in Europe, with consequent international solicitudes; and also as accounting for the fixed policy of the United States that such questions in America shall not be permitted insensibly to draw in European states as active parties to the controversy of the Isthmus, a result to which frequent disturbances tend.

The case of 1903 having arisen, by the well-ascertained fact that preparations for revolt were being made upon the Isthmus if the Hay-Herran Convention were rejected, the question follows, Did the treaty of 1846, because guaranteeing Colombia's rights of sovereignty and property against foreign invasion, also bind legally the United States not to exercise her general international right of armed interference on behalf of her threatened interests? There was ample precedent for saying that she was not so bound, but was at liberty to act for the security of transit, which was her one specific interest in Colombian territory, to safeguard which the treaty had been made. The occasion not being one of foreign invasion, but of domestic disturbance, the treaty guarantees of enforcing the neutrality of the Isthmus, or of resisting a seizure did not apply. This position had been decided nearly forty years before by Mr. Seward. But, if the treaty did not apply, in other words was non-existent as regarded the case in hand, then the general right of international law sanctioning forcible intervention remained; to be determined, as Mr. Seward had then

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

said, by considerations of grave expediency governed by circumstances.

In other words, the treaty of 1846 not being applicable, the United States possessed an unimpaired international right to act as her interests demanded. A measure which should wholly bar all access by sea to the Isthmus was entirely within her legal competence. She had a legal right even to take a side, if she chose. She did not take a side, because neither Colombian nor Panama forces were to be permitted to land within fifty miles of Panama. Certainly, the particular circumstances caused this provision to strike the Colombian forces harder than the insurgents; yet it is quite conceivable that the latter might have received help from beyond sea, for the same has often occurred in similar rebellions. The obligations of neutrality, when they exist, concern only the action taken, not the results of the action. For example, a neutral state forbids its ports to furnish coal to either belligerent. Evidently the effect is worse to the one not possessing coaling-stations near by than to the one which may have such; but this result does not impeach the neutrality of the action.

The order to the United States naval officers not to permit a landing within fifty miles of Panama was therefore wholly within the legal competence of the United States. It insured the neutrality of the Isthmus; an expression which means simply that the territory shall not be permitted to be a scene of war. The result was that the insurrection was successful, and that the independence of the district of Panama was proclaimed by its people; that is, there was no resistance to the measure by the inhabitants of the district; neither by arms nor by protest. There was no apparent division of sentiment, such as existed in many of the seceding states of our Union in 1861; and it was natural that there should be none, because great interests of the residents were involved in a favorable solution of the canal question, which the action of the Colombian Senate, though perfectly legal, had postponed indefinitely.

The declaration of Panama independence could not but remain effective as long as the United States persisted in its fifty-mile order. Upon this order, in the judgment of the United States, depended the maintenance of tranquillity; so often disturbed of late years that it may fairly be said that a perpetual expectation of disturbance was the normal



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

condition. The question then arises, How far was the United States debarred legally by the treaty guarantee from recognizing a *de facto* situation, dependent upon an attitude she was determined to maintain? The Treaty of 1846 stipulated that the United States guarantees the rights of sovereignty and property of Colombia in the Isthmus "in the same manner,"—"positively and efficaciously,"—as it guaranteed the perfect neutrality of the Isthmus. Here again, Mr. Seward, in 1865, writing with no faintest prevision of the conditions of 1903, but envisaging an entirely different problem, expressed the understanding of the United States as to the obligations of the treaty. Mr. Seward's words were based upon the opinion of the then Attorney-General, which Seward adopted:

"Neither the text nor the spirit of the stipulation in that article, by which the United States engages to preserve the neutrality of the Isthmus of Panama, imposes an obligation on this government to comply with a requisition [like that above referred to]. The purpose of the stipulation was to guarantee the Isthmus against *seizure or invasion by a foreign Power only.**

Mr. Hamilton Fish, Secretary of State, in 1871, expressed a similar opinion:

"A principal object of New Grenada in entering into the treaty is understood to have been to maintain her sovereignty over the Isthmus against any attack *from abroad.* That object has been fully accomplished. No such attack has taken place, though this Department has reason to believe that one has upon several occasions been threatened, but has been averted by warning from this Government as to its obligation under the treaty."†

In the face of these utterances it seems evident that there is no ground whatever for the assertion upon which Dr. Chamberlain rests his impeachment of the action of 1903. Dr. Chamberlain writes:

"Since the paramount issue in the case of both the neutrality and sovereignty which the United States guaranteed was the safe-guarding of the transit, there was a valid implication that the United States, on due occasion and especially at New Grenada's request, would give aid against transit interference from any source whatever, whether foreign or domestic.‡

So far from a valid implication, there was on the part of the United States an explicit repudiation of such obliga-

* *Moore's Digest,* vol. iii, p. 48. My italics.
† *Ibid.,* vol. iii, p. 27. My italics.
‡ *North American Review,* February, 1912, p. 150.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion; and as Colombia during the years since 1865 had acquiesced in this interpretation, by not denouncing the treaty, the understanding between the two governments was complete in this particular.

The seizure of the Isthmus in 1903 was not the act of a foreign Power, but of Colombian citizens; and the proclamation of independence was by the same body that effected the seizure. The seizure clearly was not of the character against which the United States by long precedent pronouncement had confined its guarantee; for it was not by foreign act, but by domestic. The sovereignty of Colombia had disappeared *de facto* before a domestic insurrection. The legal question then remaining was whether such act should be recognized by foreign states, and when. Recognition by a foreign state undoubtedly gives moral help to an insurgent, and it therefore should not be given lightly; but it is not legally operative between the parties at strife. In fact, recognition, as distinct from active aid, is not operative at all in establishing the independence of the new state, either legally or effectually. The United States dates its independence, not from the recognition by France and Spain in 1778, but from its own declaration, in 1776, as the legal origin. Great Britain did not acknowledge this independence nor cease from her efforts to subdue the United States because of the recognition by France and Spain; and these countries did not effect independence by recognition, though they subsequently did so by armed intervention in the quarrel.

By international law, recognition by a foreign state is legally discretional with that state; a matter of national policy, and of national determination as to time and circumstances. Ordinarily, the decision rests upon the establishment of a *de facto* government, ascertained to be so by organization and continuance; but there is no constraint in law that these two indications must be exacted, or that a *de jure* fact of the wishes and rights of the people may not determine the action of foreign states. The status of Crete since 1897,—not political independence, but political autonomy under the nominal suzerainty of Turkey,—is due to the action of the great Powers, expelling the Turks, after a series of revolts, as in Panama, had demonstrated that quiet could not otherwise be had.

I have tried so far to confine my consideration to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strict letter of the law; to obligation, positive and negative, as involved in the treaty of 1846. Neither by temperament nor by conviction am I inclined ordinarily to exact the strict letter of the bond. I could not have sided decisively with either Shylock or Portia in their literal interpretations. But, as the subject under discussion presents itself to me, the question is whether the United States, by the specific undertakings of the treaty of 1846, had divested itself of its general rights under international law. The frequent assertion that the relations of states are as susceptible of legal definition and enforcement as those of individual men appears to me extravagant, as to both fact and reason; but I do hold that a treaty is a promise, and that its ascertained stipulations are obligations, not only legal, but moral, having the force of promise. In such case the determination of action depends upon ascertainment of the thing promised. No question of expediency, however plausible, not even of the welfare of a third party, is to me admissible, unless under circumstances so exceptional that none such occurs to me now. I certainly do not hold that any advantage to the United States or to Panama could be advanced to justify the action of 1903, if certainly in contravention of the treaty.

If not in contravention, then the United States had liberty to take any action she saw fit under her general international legal rights as a state. The question then was not one of law, but of morals; and, except in case of absolute right and wrong, morals in the case of nations—less frequently in that of individuals—is often a matter of expediency. "The greatest good of the greatest number" is a moral aim, to be guided by considerations of morality and of expediency. The right to property is not an absolute right; it is not unconditioned, but conditioned. Municipal law, therefore, permits deprivation of property for the good of the community. The measures of the United States caused Colombia to lose property. If the action which so resulted was legal, its rectitude otherwise is to be judged by moral considerations; and these are to be applied not to the facts of the moment only, but also to those anterior, if furnishing a continuous, consistent record. The good of the United States; the national self-interest, which singularly enough is considered by many the sole justifying reason for national interventions; the good of Panama; the good of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foreign states, American or non-American; the good—or evil—to Colombia herself; the obligations following upon a systematic policy pursued by the United States in years past, which not only reserved the canal control to herself alone, but insistently excluded all other Powers capable of such control; all these factors enter as considerations in deciding whether the course of the United States was proper. It is always to be remembered, as before said, that the question now is no mere criticism of a past action of a single man, but a determination whether the United States people have been and still are the perpetrators of an unatoned wrong.

Positions like the Isthmus of Panama cannot be considered on a footing merely of uni-state property. They belong essentially to the world, because the world has need of them. The accident of possession undoubtedly gives particular claims to consideration and remuneration; and both consideration and remuneration were tendered and accepted by the Hay-Herran Convention. To this the Colombian Senate opposed the Colombian Constitution as forbidding cession of sovereignty over national territory. Mr. Hay replied that the Convention actually secured such sovereignty, conceding to the United States only a limited control for police and sanitation, indispensable to the construction and management. The clause in the Convention to this effect, quoted by Mr. Hay, runs:

> "The United States freely acknowledges and recognizes this sovereignty [of Colombia] and disavows any intention to impair it in any way whatever, or to increase its territory at the expense of Colombia."*

In short, the United States required, not political sovereignty, but the administrative control of the ground to be occupied by a great industrial enterprise undertaken by it; just as any corporation requires control of its own grounds. This does not impair the rights of sovereignty, any more than a lease impairs the property rights of an owner.

In any case the constitution of a country is valid to itself alone; it is not a reply in international contentions. When Italians were executed by popular uprising in New Orleans, it was no reply to Italy that the Constitution of the United States left the central government no power to punish a

* *Moore's Digest*, vol. iii, p. 95.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crime committed in Louisiana. A street for the world needed to be opened through Colombian property; and Colombia could not present her constitution as a valid bar. Had immediate steps been taken to remedy the difficulty, something might be said for delay; but the Colombian Congress, without providing any bases for the reopening of negotiations, adjourned for a year, during which time the matter was "hung up." Not even a beginning at amendment would be made. Under such circumstances the "to-morrow" of Spanish tradition became portentous, and is a fair matter for present consideration as to the present accountability of the American people.

From limitations of space I refrain from considering the grosser pecuniary motives alleged to have influenced the Colombian Senate. That such were existent and operative will, I think, be the conclusion of those who will read attentively the messages of President Roosevelt and the correspondence of Mr. Hay and General Reyes. Though not necessarily determinative of moral judgment, because possibly not morally wrong in men making a bargain for their country, even if evidently narrow and shortsighted, the facts have a sinister appearance and bear upon the general verdict touching the moral propriety of the action of the United States. But there is another allegation, not against the Colombian Senate, but against the Executive who arranged the Hay-Herran Convention and submitted it as signed for the approval of the Senate. This I quote textually from Mr. Hay. After stating at length certain actions of the Colombian Government, which he claimed were in direct contravention of agreements in the treaty, which agreements had been accepted after full discussion of the points involved, Mr. Hay wrote:

"This state of affairs continued until General Fernandez, in charge of the ministry of finance [that is, Secretary of the Treasury to the Colombian Government], issued, more than a month before the Congress was convoked [in special session] and more than two months before it met, a circular to the Bogotá press, which, as Mr. Beaupré* reported, 'had suddenly sprung into existence,' inviting discussion of the convention. The circular in substance stated, according to Mr. Beaupré's report, that the [Colombian] government 'had no preconceived wishes for or against the measure'; that it was 'for Congress to decide,' and that Congress would be largely guided by 'public opinion.' In view of what the government had already done, it is not strange that this invitation to discussion was followed by violent attacks upon the convention, accompa-

* The American Minister to Colombia.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nied by the most extravagant speculations as to the gains which Colombia might possibly derive from its rejection." *

In brief, the Colombian Executive having after prolonged discussion entered into an agreement with the United States, sought itself to overturn this in popular opinion as conducive to rejection by the Senate. In this it succeeded. A public act of a Secretary of the Treasury is the act of the government of which he is part, unless by it repudiated. Although this measure in itself would not affect the moral obligation of the United States to act with due consideration of all interests concerned, it did effectively dispose of any claim of Colombia to special consideration as especially affected. Mr. Hay's comment on this transaction will commend itself, I think, to most men:

"Treaties are not definitely binding till they are ratified; but it is a familiar rule that, unless it is otherwise provided, they are binding on the contracting parties [in this case the two governments] from the date of their signature, and that in such case the exchange of ratifications confirms the treaty from that date. This rule necessarily implies that the two governments, in agreeing to the treaty through their duly authorized representatives, bind themselves, pending its ratification, not only not to oppose its consummation, but also to do nothing in contravention of its terms." †

What would the British or French governments, or our own people, have thought, if, after the Arbitration Treaties of 1911 were signed, the United States Government had proclaimed to its public through the general press that it invited discussion of the points to which the Senate afterward refused consent, and was indifferent whether they were accepted or not?

In conclusion, it is beneficial to observe that the summary ejectment of Colombia from property which she could not improve herself, and against the improvement of which by another she raised frivolous obstacles, is precisely in line with transactions going on all over the world; to the great distress of many worthy people who think that law should, or can, settle all matters, binding nations in links of iron. India, Egypt, Persia, Tripoli, Tunis, Algiers, Morocco, all stand on the same general basis as Panama. The world has needed them; and technical possession by legal prescription has fallen, still falls, and should continue

* *Moore's Digest,* vol. iii, p. 98.
† *Moore's Digest,* vol. iii, p. 96.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to fall, before the advance of the world, when the owners are unable or unwilling to improve or to confer security.

Law is a valuable instrument; invaluable is a more fitting word. But it is only an instrument, it is not a principle. It is a contrivance, a means; not an end. Man is not for law, but law for man. That France in eighty years' occupancy has raised the commerce of Algiers from one million dollars to two hundred millions; that in Tunis in thirty years the increase is from eight millions to forty millions, and that in the same time two thousand miles of good road have been built; the benefits done by Great Britain to Egypt—all these do not so much justify the new administrators in their original action as condemn the old as worthless cumberers of the ground, and therefore rightfully dispossessed. The horrified plea of legal possession violated is in such cases a mere figment of law. It illustrates what has been already said: that Law is a means, not an end; a good servant, but a bad master. So in Panama.

It is sometimes urged: Would the United States have acted thus in the case of a strong state? The question posed by the word "strong" is one not of right, to which this paper is limited, but of expediency. In 1911, France, Germany, and Great Britain, all strong states, maintained severally what each considered right; but their course was modified by expediency, formulated by diplomacy, and based upon armament. The reply to the query, however, is that necessity for such action rarely arises with strong states, if the word "strong" be correctly defined. A strong state is one that maintains habitually peace and security within its borders, and improves its possessions. Turkey, exclusive of nominal dependencies, has 27,000,000 people. Is Turkey a strong state? Holland has under 6,000,000, Belgium little over 7,000,000. Yet even Belgium has had occasion to notice that if sovereignty be abused in a matter of world concern—as in the Congo Free State—the world will call her to account. The Isthmus of Panama, because of its interoceanic possibilities, was and is a world concern, in so far that if there be maladministration the world will interfere. If the United States do not give good administration and security she will hear from the world, though she be a strong state.

A. T. Mahan.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# NEW BOOKS REVIEWED

THE NEW REALISM; CO-OPERATIVE STUDIES IN PHILOSOPHY. By EDWIN B. HOLT, WALTER T. MARVIN, WILLIAM PEPPERRELL MONTAGUE, RALPH BARTON PERRY, WALTER B. PITKIN, and EDWARD GLEASON SPAULDING. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1912.

Professor Perry opens his contribution to this co-operative volume with a quotation from William James, running as follows: "Strangest of all, natural realism, so long decently buried, raises its head above the turf and finds glad hands outstretched from the most unlikely quarters to help it to its feet again." The sentence was written eight years ago. This volume is evidence that natural realism has, in the intervening years, gained an ability to walk alone as well as to stand erect. Twenty years ago some type of idealism was in practically undisputed possession of at least the academic and professional field—the chairs of philosophy in the colleges—in England and this country. For the time spiritualistic idealisms, derived directly or indirectly from the Kantian and post-Kantian movement in Germany, eclipsed the empirical idealisms of the Berkeleyan strain dominant in the prior generation of Mill and Bain and their followers. But at most philosophical quarrels were confined within the divisions of the idealistic camp. The voices raised in realistic protest were dismissed as belated utterances of those living intellectually in the days of darkness that preceded Berkeley and Kant.

Pragmatism issued the first effective challenge to the idealistic régime. Whatever may be said of its own career and probable fate, the noise that it made in the philosophic world is evidence that the times were ripe for a change. In both this country and England realists took the field in large numbers, joining hands with the pragmatists so far as the latter were anti-idealistic, while attacking them as still fundamentally infected with the subjective taint of idealism.

The genesis of the present volume, in its co-operative aspect at least, was in a brief joint contribution to one of the American philosophical journals in 1910, entitled "The Programme and First Platform of Six Realists"—the same six that have written the present volume. Two of the contributors are from Harvard, two from Columbia, one from Princeton, one from Rutgers. The book is opened by a general unsigned essay (which the non-professional reader will probably find the most interesting in the volume), giving the general setting and bearing of the realistic revival. Professor Marvin follows with an account of "The Emancipation of Metaphysics from Epistemology"; then comes Professor Perry with "A Realistic Theory of Independence"; then Professor Spaulding with "A Defense of Analysis," Professor Montague with "A Realistic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Theory of Truth and Error," Professor Holt on "The Place of Illusory Experience in a Realistic World," and, finally, Professor Pitkin on "Some Realistic Implications of Biology." An appendix sets forth briefly and with candor some of the points upon which the six realists are not entirely agreed among themselves.

While it seems probable that the divergences among the various writers, especially as to the nature of consciousness, will become more and more pronounced in the future growth of the school, it must be admitted that the book as a whole is a compact and coherent presentation of a single philosophic point of view. The subjects of the essays differ sufficiently, so that there is but little repetition; and each reinforces the effort of the others. The net result is an impressive solidity, which augurs well for the experiment of co-operation in philosophic undertakings. The need of condensation has given the essays definiteness, even terseness, of form; while the unusual clearness of the style—considering the technical nature of its subject-matter—suggests that the essayists have, through mutual consultations, profited by that critical reaction of other minds which, under the ordinary conditions of philosophic writing, comes too late to be of use. As to the substance of the volume, the fact that even six vigorous and independent minds find themselves so genuinely—with so little evidence of forced agreement—in accord upon the essentials of a new philosophic position is a symptom of the first order of importance of the intellectual temper of the day.

Alexander Bain remarked of a "New Realism" of his day that it was the "old realism with Berkeley gagged." Not even the most devoted adherent of idealism will venture this criticism of the present work. Its marked feature is its denial of the dualism of the older realistic theories, its assertion that we know real things directly and not through their mental representatives; and its dependence upon the results of recent science, especially of mathematical analysis, or the new logic of mathematics. The ultimate destiny of the movement is bound up with success or failure as regards these two points. To make good as respects the first the new realism must develop a positive and constructive account of conscious life—the point as to which (as already noted) the writers differ most among themselves. Professor Perry seems to have hit upon the most likely method of procedure when he holds that when real objects enter consciousness they enter into new biological and social relations which confer new traits upon them, leaving, however, their strictly physical traits intact, independent of consciousness because deducible from independent physical considerations.

The other critical point, certainly crucial and possibly vulnerable, is the acceptance of the doctrine that logical and mathematical entities and relations are logically prior to all concrete existences, whether physical or mental. To many persons this doctrine will seem to prove too much. If real things are as independent one of another as are mathematical points from one another, it does not require much acumen to conclude that they are independent of mind. But such intellectual atomism will seem to many to be a *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole "independence" theory.

On the other hand, the frank recognition of the absolutely real nature of the universals of logic and mathematics (the writers do not hesitate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to call this phase of their doctrine "Platonic Realism")—will provoke a retort from idealists that the New Realism is only an inverted idealism. To base the structure of the physical and psychological world upon purely ideal entities of number, space, and time, divorced from concrete physical and mental existences, is assuredly a New Realism, but a realism strangely like Platonic Idealism shorn of its poetry and its ethical bias.

---

POST-LIMINIUM—LIONEL JOHNSON. New York: Mitchell Kennerley, 1912.

Lionel Johnson belonged to a coterie of self-conscious and meticulous artists. Like Mrs. Meynell, Louise Imogen Guiney, Francis Thompson, John Davidson, and Michael Field, he worked slowly and finished elaborately. In turning the three hundred pages, which in this volume contain forty-four essays, one wonders if the fastidious author would ever have given them publicity and the sanction of his name. They are not essays to be ashamed of. Lionel Johnson could never have written anything false or futile. But they are the casual output of a hard-worked writer, reviewing, criticizing, giving estimates swiftly made on unrelated topics. To be sure, an estimate from Lionel Johnson is one from an opulent and discerning mind, but, when all is said and done, the book is made up of shreds and patches. The notes on his master, Pater, divided into four separate essays—"Mr. Pater on Plato," "Mr. Pater's Humor," "Mr. Pater and His Public," "The Work of Mr. Pater"—form the best and most complete study in the book—a book ranging from St. Francis, Blake, and Coventry Patmore to Parnell, Stevenson, and Burke.

Essays, however swiftly turned out, must retain the temperamental color of their author's mind, and many passages in these short pieces bespeak the rare quality of their writer; as when he says of Pater's Platonic Studies: "They are perfect expressions of the Academic spirit; *that leisurely travel of the mind among great things*"; or of Lucretius that he is the "Michael Angelo of verse, a Titanic workman, compelling language to obey his sovereign will and fall into majestic cadence, thunderous oceanic"; or of St. Francis: "The wind of the Spirit blowing where it listeth made Francis saint; the Fire of the Spirit chose to flame in his heart; Seraphic Love elected to inhabit there; 'this sort cometh not' but by the gift and grace of immediate genius, uncalculating, simple, and intuitive; it cannot come of planning, of studying and pondering, of wishes father to the thought." Or again: "No man can serve two masters: you cannot be Fielding's friend and also accept the colossal ineptitudes of our most popular novelists, witless, humorless, most brazen."

The essays are worth putting on the shelf with the permanent occupants, if for no other reason for their wide swath of allusion and their rarely felicitous turn of expression.

---

J. M. SYNGE; A CRITICAL STUDY. By P. P. HOWE. New York: Mitchell Kennerley, 1912.

There are publishers' advisers who remember well when about six or seven years ago the first neat manuscripts of Synge's *Plays* went the round of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the publishers. In vain they pleaded that here was genius and the real, great thing. Those higher up insisted that here was but a fad, soon to pass. "Lies and the Lives will be written of him soon," said John Masefield, but even those readers who pleaded his cause most eloquently failed to know how soon.

The present graceful and able study constantly compares Synge's sense for comedy with that of Shakespeare and Molière. This is by no means to compare Synge himself with Molière and Shakespeare. Quantity of output alone would forbid that. But it does point to the rare touch and unusual quality in the work. That Synge was a great genius no discerning reader can question. There is fine and keen characterization, exquisite poetry, and an almost unrivaled sensibility to life flowing by us in the work. His blind beggar says, "I'm thinking, by the mercy of God, it's few sees anything but them is blind for a space," and the intensity and minuteness of Synge's vision of all the wonder and beauty of the world is like the sudden, amazed awakening to life of one whose vision comes all of a sudden and after waiting. He sees life with surprise, with passion, and with tenderness. Not only this, but he sees the whole of life and its wide-spreading significance in a small room where a few Irish peasants talk and listen and remember. "The room," says Mr. Howe, "is never a vacuum like Ibsen's; nor an aquarium in which figures float, intense but dim, like Maeterlinck's, or beautiful and recondite like Mr. Yeats's; it is never a room into which we look from the outside. We are in the room. We have come in from a wide life, and we shall go out and down again in a moment to it. Over the half of the door come the little sounds of general humanity, sharpened to an intensity of clearness; over it are stretched maybe the colors of the sunset."

The present study is not a biography, but it is a very able study in dramatic criticism, and is, as all serious criticism should be, an appreciation. One by one, Mr. Howe presents the six short plays. He gives a chapter on Synge's use of the note-book; another on design and composition of the plays; one on characterization, and another on the prefaces. The bibliography which concludes the volume is all too short, bringing to mind the writer's untimely death. It is a very able and discerning introduction to the greatest genius of the Celtic Renaissance.

---

THERE ARE CRIMES AND CRIMES. By AUGUST STRINDBERG. Translated by EDWIN BJÖRKMAN. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912.

The swift succession of Strindberg's translations proves to us that he is regarded as one of the permanent forces in literature. In reading the plays one wonders if, like Ibsen, he may not ultimately find his place among the great constructors of the drama rather than a great painter of contemporary character. There seems no doubt but that the difficulties and hardships of his own life cut him off from any balanced and normal conception of life.

The present play was written in 1899, when Strindberg was about fifty years old, at a period when, having undergone great mental strain and anxiety, he had turned to the great mystics for solace and certainty. Opposite his works of 1897-98 he wrote in the analytical summary of his work: "The great crisis at the age of fifty; revolutions in the life of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the soul; desert wanderings; Swedenborgian heavens and hells," and against the work of the following year is set: "Light after darkness; new productivity with recovered Faith, Hope, and Love—and with full, rock-firm certitude." The translator, who writes a prefatory study of the play, finds in it the moral that moderation verging upon asceticism is wise for most men, and essential to the man of genius who wishes to fulfil his divine mission. On the whole, we find in the play a much more subtle and spiritual lesson than that of asceticism. Rather Strindberg seems to be pressing home the very teaching of Jesus, that the sins of the spirit are as productive of evil as sins of actual commission. Maurice in the play did not kill his child, but he wished her out of the way. He was hardly unfaithful to his mistress, but he wished her out of his successful, forth-striding life. Henriette and her sisters had not committed a crime; they had merely *wished* a crime. In Strindberg's mystical, religious period he felt that, after all, it was the thoughts he had harbored that had tarnished his life, and it was at mental, not physical, crime that he was aiming his arrows. The ending of the play, in which Maurice determines to go to church and heal his soul one evening, but to return to his worldly success the next, is exceedingly weak.

The interest of the play lies in the sincere effort to see into the nature of sin, and there are moments in the play of great dramatic capacity, as, for example, that where Henriette and Maurice meet, and again in the scene where, knowing each other's capacity for evil, they heap suspicions upon each other.

---

BERGSON. By JOSEPH SOLOMON. New York: Dodge Publishing Company, 1912.

Bergson is foredoomed. He cannot escape popularity. Partly the charm and lucidity of his style invites followers, partly his conclusions as to freedom, reality, creation, growth, fall in with the natural common-sense preconceptions of man. Free will seems to the common-or-garden man the very nature of his individuality, so it is agreeable to find a philosophy which, instead of assuring him that his choices are merest illusions, assures him that there is that in the nature of life and consciousness which is itself essentially free will. The reality is the life which has evolved us, and the life itself offers us a portion of its freedom, its incalculable openness to development.

To write a cursory introduction to Bergson is not an easy task. Those who care to speculate upon the nature of their existence will read and hear the philosopher himself. Those who desire to take cursory note of a passing phase of thought will get a few catchwords and very probably much misconception from such little volumes as this. The book belongs in the series of "Philosophers, Ancient and Modern," fifteen volumes of which have been published. Bergson is the only one whose work has attracted so much attention that he has been included while yet living. "His reassertion, in a far more explicit form it is true, of one of the imperishable ideas of antiquity, his bold arraignment, which is at the same time in a way a justification, of the whole course of philosophy from Socrates downward, his conception, for the first time definite and duly limited, of evolution, and his great learning—all seem to justify the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inclusion," writes the author. The little book contains five chapters dealing with, I., "Change"; II., "Life"; III., "Evolution"; IV., "Thought, Intelligence, Knowledge, Reasoning, and Logic"; and, V., "Conclusion," a final summing-up.

The chief and most widely known point of Bergson's philosophy is the Heraclitean doctrine that all things move; that life is in flux. The first chapter is naturally an attempt to make clear the bases and result of Bergson's theory of time and duration—time, as an abstraction; duration, as a felt reality. Bergson does not hesitate to say that time affects the animate but not the inanimate—*i. e.*, that change in the animate can only be represented as continuous processes having duration; while changes in the inanimate cannot be observed as such by us. Abstract time is just the common measure of all duration, duration is measured by time; yet we choose our representative of time (clock, earth, etc.) by reference to the duration of its processes, thus turning round in a circle without outlet.

While here and there Mr. Solomon interlards his short summary of Bergsonian processes with such criticism as this, he does not on the whole attempt more than to give an easy outline and short summary of the new philosophy. It is inevitable that such summaries should be fertile soil for misconception. One feels, after looking it through, much as he did who was accosted by a young woman studying psychology, who just before examination demanded, "Couldn't you give me in a few words the main points of Kant's philosophy?"

---

THE RENAISSANCE. By J. BASIL OLDHAM, M.A. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, 1912.

This book treats a large subject in small space but with such wisdom in omission, such power of packing much into little, that the book is a very marvel of concise treatment. There is not a threadbare or conventional phrase in the book. The author knows his period from end to end, and knows also what is vital to the understanding of it. In making this little volume he has managed in one hundred and twenty short pages to pack the meaning of that wonderful revival of life, of learning, of art and thought. The book is divided and summarized to suit beginning students, but it is equally convenient for reference to the real reader. The illustrations are chosen with taste to point the spirit of certain trends; Bennozzo Gozzoli's "Lorenzo de' Medici," Leonardo's "Mona Lisa," Michael Angelo's "Moses" illustrate art tendencies in Italy; "Azay-le-Rideau" the awakening in France; while the decadence of the Renaissance and the birth of realism are illustrated by Veronese's "Marriage at Cana," Raphael's "Incendio del Borgo," and Mantegna's Brera "Pietà." The book is entirely up to date, and aware of the very latest results of scholarship and investigation.

---

TAOIST TEACHINGS. Translated from the Chinese by LIONEL GILES, M.A. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, 1912.

This most recent addition to the valuable "Wisdom of the East" series contains extracts from the *Book of Lieh Tzu.* Lionel Giles follows the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

method of his more celebrated father in printing his explanatory or desultory comment upon the anecdotes and stories in smaller type at whatever points in the pages they are called for. This relieves one of the pedantic foot-note method, and gives quite the impression of story-telling and *viva voce* comment. The stories are chosen to illustrate Lieh Tzu's theories of cosmogony, legends of the Yellow Emperor, dreams of the unreality of phenomena, stories about Confucius, the questions of T'ang, effort and destiny and causality. The editors of the series express in the prefatory note their hope that the publication of their series may make for the greater good-will and understanding between the East and the West—the Old World of Thought and the New World of Action. Such good-will is coming through many ambassadors, and doubtless the familiarity with the literature of a people is one of the most persuasive of these. The stories chosen and translated are quaint and interesting, and do much toward making clear to us the skeptical, mystical, speculative mind of the East.

---

THE VIEWS OF VANNOC. By ARNOLD WHITE. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. Imported by E. P. Dutton, New York, 1912.

To publish a volume of unrelated essays is as hazardous an affair as to publish a volume of sonnets. The essay must justify itself by beauty of structure and diction since the substance is admittedly casual and slight. A literary essay is written, not because the author has something of vital import to say, but because a happy fancy, a gift of perception, a psychological turn of thought, can be daintily clothed. Form alone excuses fragility.

From this point of view the essays are disappointing. They are not constructed essays, but fragmentary notes, tersely and directly expressed, with here and there a chance beauty, as when he says in the essay on the "Mystery of Birds": "The sea-bird's song is as melancholy as the ocean which tosses below when they float on the western gale." This, however, is an isolated sentence, and the essay, with its title suggesting hidden lovelinesses and unknown flights, in no wise, lives up to this example. Indeed, in the end, nothing is told us of the mystery of birds or of the miraculously beautiful and shifting patterns of their flight across the heavens. On the contrary, birds supply Vannoc with a plea for armaments on the grounds that when food is abundant on the ground and peace reigns, owing to absence of enemies, birds become extinct. Analogies of this light nature are fatal modes of thought and one also asks whether the writer's natural history is not at fault. Certainly, nowhere are the song-birds more cared for and nurtured than in England and nowhere more plentiful. The glance at the abnormal appetites of birds and the habitual patricide of the robins is amusing.

Here and there one picks up a happy sentiment, such as: "To be interesting, one must be interested. To be interested, one must live in the open—always in soul, generally in the mind, as much as may be in the body. No man is really sound who has not a large circle of human beings whom he finds interesting."

Wisdom does not abound in the little book, for Vannoc is evidently of those who cannot think right because they are too comfortable to view any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

changes with courage. The little volume is, however slight, suggestive, and amusing, and for a volume of essays has achieved in England a quite unusual popularity.

---

THE STRANGLING OF PERSIA. By W. MORGAN SHUSTER. New York: The Century Company, 1912.

It is not often that the American public is given the opportunity to hear from an authoritative source a sober and detailed account of a foreign political situation. This, however, is what W. Morgan Shuster, in his book, *The Strangling of Persia,* has given. In the light of eight months' residence in Teheran as Treasurer-General, a position which afforded him ample opportunity to study the situation at close range, Mr. Shuster has written with restraint the story of this Oriental people, who, hampered by inexperience and ignorance, were struggling heroically for independence. He pays a glowing tribute to the courage, the self-sacrifice, and integrity of the handful of patriots in the Medjlis; to the populace who supported this representative body in the unequal struggle against the avarice and cupidity of the majority of the cabinet officials, constantly subjected to Russian influence; to the Persian women who, like their other sisters in the East, threw off the traditions of centuries to stand bravely for progress and liberating ideas. Mr. Shuster's narrative is free from bitterness; the book is not in the least an attack. Every statement is substantiated by unquestionable documentary evidence. Yet he has left no disillusionment as to the part played by the two so-called Christian nations who so safely disregarded pledges given to an Eastern people making a gallant struggle for life.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED